

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, New Hampshire

Minutes of October 20, 2014

DRAFT

Members Present: Barbara Miller, Rich Clark, Ivy Vann, Tom Weeks, Jerry Galus, Audrey Cass and Alan Zeller

Staff Present: Peter Throop, Director and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development

Vice Chairman Tom Weeks (Mr. Weeks) called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. He introduced himself and the Board and Staff. He informed the audience “this is a continuation of an application for a Conditional Use Permit by Dancing Ground Farm, LLC but we have Minutes to approve first.”

Minutes:

A motion was made/seconded (Miller/Zeller) to approve the Minutes of September 29, 2014 as written with all in favor.

Mr. Weeks then read the public notice for Dancing Ground Farm as follows: “this is a continuation of an application for a Conditional Use Permit for Agricultural Business Enterprise uses submitted by Dancing Ground Farm, LLC for uses proposed at Four Winds Farm, located in the Rural Zoning District at 149 Four Winds Farm Road, Parcel ID# R004-032-000 and R004-013-000. Specifically, the application proposes to permit up to 4 large events per year with between 75 and 175 attendees including staff and service providers, and not more than 12 smaller events per year with up to 75 attendees including staff and service providers, such events including weddings, seasonal farm events, farm to table dinners and educational events.”

Mr. Weeks then reviewed the procedural order of the meeting with the applicant providing any new testimony followed by questions from the Board and then questions and concerns from the audience. He noted “questions and concerns should focus on any *new* information the audience may have for this application, not questions or concerns regarding the ordinance approved by the town.” He then asked all questions be directed to him “with no talking amongst yourselves.”

Mr. Weeks told the audience the Board had met with the town attorney on October 15th that the meeting was protected by attorney/client privilege “and there will be no discussion about it at this hearing tonight.” He looked up and said “this is the third hearing on this application and we would appreciate getting to a decision tonight.”

Bryn Dumas introduced himself as the applicant noting “there is not a lot of new information other than we did have a private event for a friend at the farm on October 11th and we tried to keep it to the plan we submitted.” He noted “it went very well logistically and we learned that having three parking attendants is better than two.” He also noted the intent to relocate the portable toilet facilities closer to the Studio barn’s second means of egress which was pointed out at the site visit. “Other than that, all went well” he said.

Mr. Weeks noted that at the meeting September 29th “the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. were discussed” adding his concerns that with an event ending at 10:00 p.m., it may be close to 11:00 p.m. by the time everyone actually leaves. He noted the noise disruption of post-event socialization and car doors closing after 10 p.m. He asked Mr. Dumas how the event (ending) went the other night. Mr. Dumas replied “the event began about 4:00 p.m. with a ceremony at the main house and then everything was moved to the Studio barn. He told the Board the band members were first to finish their meal so they broke down that table and started playing.

Mr. Dumas told the Board as the band played he walked up and down Four Winds Farm Road and to the driveway of the nearest abutters. He reported he could lightly hear the music but he could also hear the traffic going over the rumble strips on Route 101. Mr. Galus asked if the entire event was cleaned up that night with Mr. Dumas replying “the services staff cleaned up the plates and catering stuff that needed to be returned” and that “about 90% of the cleanup was done that night” adding “we came back the next to finished up the next day.”

Mr. Weeks asked “does the Board have any thoughts on the hours of operation?” Mr. Zeller, Mr. Galus and Ms. Cass agreed that it could take up to an hour to have all guests leave. Mr. Dumas explained “10:00 p.m. is not an unreasonable time” adding “a wedding dinner isn’t a typical dinner in that speeches and toasts are made” and the bride and groom spend time welcoming their guests. “I think it is undesirable to say you have to done by 10:00 p.m. on a weekend. That does not seem terribly realistic to me” he said. Mr. Weeks replied “my concern is the event ending at 10:00 p.m. and the noise of the cars running to possibly 11:00 p.m.”

Mr. Holmes interjected “it is four times a year” with Mr. Weeks replying “I understand that.” Mr. Galus interjected “excuse me, four or sixteen times a year?” Mr. Weeks asked each member about their thoughts. Mr. Clark replied “I like 10:00” Ms. Miller replied “I have no questions, 10:00” Mr. Zeller said 9:00, Mr. Galus said 9:00, Ms. Cass said 9:00 and Mr. Weeks was firm at 9:00 as well. Anne Meiklejohn raised her hand and asked if the Board was considering this a vote. Mr. Weeks replied “it is not a vote, just a discussion to see where we are going.” Mr. Zeller noted that he had been to many weddings “they occur at all times, but most happen in the middle of the day.”

Mr. Weeks noted “that brings me to my second question.” He gave an example of a farm event “say an apple picking event that turns into a concert.” He noted the music must be an accessory to the use permitted by the Conditional Use Permit.” He then suggested live or recorded music be limited to weddings and farm to table dinners. Mrs. Holmes stood up and said “I see what you are saying, we don’t want to make the music the event at all” adding “but in terms of non-amplified music having someone strumming a guitar and singing apple songs does not make music the event.” Mr. Weeks replied “this (approval) runs with the land not the applicant. I just want to make sure there will be no concerts that are being called a farm event.” Ms. Cass agreed noting fundraisers for farms where the music is secondary “but it is the primary reason people come.” Mr. Spencer interjected “we completely agree with the sense of what you are saying and concur.”

Lastly Mr. Weeks addressed the accountability issue. “The concern is keeping track of the people coming and going to an event. It is difficult to do” he said. A brief discussion of ticket sales and other potential suggestions to provide accountability followed with the members agreeing there would not be more than 75 people at an event at any given time.

Mr. Weeks confirmed the relocation of the portable toilet facilities and asked about the five parking spaces assigned to staff and service providers. He voiced his concern that if that area was in the Wetland Protection District “they would not meet the setback required.” He asked Mr. Dumas if it was possible to relocate them if necessary and amend the plan to reflect it. Mr. Dumas replied he could, “if would be easy to move that area to the back” he said.

Mr. Galus interjected “I seem to be the one always asking about the liquor” adding “but I would like to see a condition that appropriate state licenses or whatever needed are obtained for events.” Mr. Dumas agreed that would be the case. Ms. Cass asked how the signage for the private event was handled with Mr. Dumas pointing out the location of where the directional signs were placed. “It worked very well” he said. Mr. Weeks asked how many guests were present at the private

event with Mr. Dumas replying “about 120 perhaps 130 with staff” adding “and about 65 cars.”

With no further questions from the Board Mr. Weeks opened the public hearing to the audience.

Quentin Peacock introduced himself and said “they need to tell the story of the rest of the evening (after 10:00). They have not mentioned that.” Mr. Dumas told the members the wedding party had a fireworks display after 10:00 p.m. He added he had since consulted with the Police Chief who had told him while legal, any fireworks display should be done by 9:30 p.m. at the latest. A brief discussion about fireworks followed with the Board determining that while Class C fireworks are permitted there was not a town ordinance that anyone knew of to regulate them.

Ms. Mickeljohn told the Board “I think we need a lot more information with the fireworks, it is very murky.” She reported the fireworks started at about 10:20 p.m. and went on for about 15 minutes. She pointed out the location of the display being close to the event, over the field and about 100 yards away from where the sheep were penned. “I am sure they were frightened” she said adding “and they frightened my thirteen year old son.”

Ms. Micklejohn looked to Mr. Dumas and said “we need some clarity here” she then asked “did the organizers know about the fireworks?” Mr. Dumas shook his head back and forth. “Is that a no?” asked Ms. Mickeljohn. Mr. Dumas replied “that is a no.” Ms. Mickeljohn looked to the Board and said “if the organizers of an event up to 175 people did not know a 15-minute Class C fireworks display 100 yards from their sheep was going to go on at their very first event, what type of managers are they?” She told the Board she had a video of the fireworks in their entirety adding “this was nothing more than an *in your face*, total lack of respect for the abutters. The noise, the impact was so disrespectful. If the managers *did not know*, they were very poor managers. If they *did* know, they were very poor managers.”

“Anything else?” asked Mr. Weeks.

Ms. Meikeljohn went on to ask about the music and attendance numbers. She noted a lack of standards and that “whatever exists now has been made up as went along. I am not even sure where this application stands now” she said adding “we almost need to come up with a new one.” She told the Board “10:00 is not 10:20 with 35 minutes of whooping and hollering after.” She noted the schedule of 16 events would be conducted in about 8 months out of the year “most likely concentrated in the summer months.” She questioned the deadlock of the Board’s vote regarding

Site Plan Review at the last meeting. She reiterated that the change in use was obvious adding “under state regulations this farm is not up and running. These events are not supplementing the farm, they are the dominant function. This is a commercial use in a rural setting under the guise of a farm.” She went on to point out the change in use of the existing buildings on the property.

Ms. Meiklejohn told the members the farmhouse with apartments was changing into a wedding venue. “If that is not a change in use I don’t know what is” she said adding “and across the street you have a barn yard turning into a parking lot. It is so much like the Joni Mitchell song (they paved paradise and put up a parking lot), it is ridiculous.” Mr. Weeks noted “parking associated with agriculture does not trigger Site Plan Review.

Ms. Meiklejohn asked “so weddings constitute agricultural business?” Mr. Weeks replied “the split vote indicates that the motion failed, that they did not find this is a change in use and Site Plan Review is not required.” Ms. Meiklejohn asked “so farming is the primary activity of the land as it relates to agritourism?” Mr. Weeks replied “agritourism has nothing to do with this request. It is not called agritourism.” Ms. Meiklejohn replied “they cannot have it both ways, they can’t.” She then asked about the use of the house for the wedding ceremony. Mr. Weeks replied “the residential use of the house is allowed.” Mr. Dumas interjected “the private wedding was at the main house and the dinner and reception were moved to the Studio barn.” Mr. Weeks noted “that has nothing to do with this application” adding “a couple of weeks ago someone had a private wedding at a private residence.”

Ann LaPointe introduced herself and told the Board “this past weekend I attended a 12-hour contra dance, 12:00 noon to 12:00 midnight at the Town House.” Someone interjected “in the Commercial District.” *There was disruption in the audience and the rest of the statement could not be heard.*

Loretta Laurenitis introduced herself and told the Board “we got home just after the fireworks so we did not get jolted out of bed and we did not have to deal with frightened kids or and elderly parents upset with the noise.” She recalled that the band’s hours had been limited “so how about limits for the fireworks?” and then asked “and how many other things do you have to provide limits for?” Ms. Laurenitis went on to say “also, I don’t get how two motions, one for Site Plan Review and one not is interpreted as meaning this must proceed as an agricultural related activity.” She asked “where does that leave this whole issue?” Mr. Weeks reviewed the two motions, one noting a change in use and the other requiring Site Plan Review with a deadlocked (tie) vote on each. “If we were to vote again today I believe the votes would be identical” he said. He then looked around the table

and asked the members “would you like to vote on another motion for Site Plan Review?” the members many shaking their heads replied “no.”

Ms. Meiklejohn interjected “Ivy recused herself in this case, may I ask why an alternate wasn’t appointed at the last meeting? Mr. Weeks replied “we don’t have any alternates” adding “we just appointed voted one in last week but we didn’t have any before that.” Ms. Meiklejohn asked “is it possible to suggest that given what I have indicated about the apartment building turning into a wedding venue that a change in use has occurred?” A brief discussion about the location and occupancy of the two apartments in the Studio barn followed with Mr. Weeks resolving “no. It is an existing building and up to 16 events have been requested to be held there.” “It is a commercial venue” replied Ms. Meiklejohn.

Duncan Spencer introduced himself and told the Board he could provide them with old brochures advertising weddings “with the costs of staying overnight and maid service.” He went on to explain how the farm had been a camp and housed an apple business. “It has absolutely been commercial all the time” he said.

Francie Von Mertens introduced herself and said “the farmers know their animals and they would be relieved to have a fireworks condition, they don’t want their sheep to hear the fireworks.” She then asked the members if they knew more on their options regarding the Conditional Use Permit having met with town counsel. Citing attorney/client privilege, Mr. Weeks replied “We are not going to go there.” He went on to say “I believe there was some question about Bartlett v. Manchester and I can tell you that had nothing to do with a Conditional Use Permit, it had to do with a Variance” adding “that is as far as I am going to take it.”

Ms. Von Mertens then said “I have heard a migration of numbers and would like to be sure about the number of people at an event being **75 total** or no more than **75 at any given time?**” She noted her concern with the potential of twice as much traffic with the latter scenario and asked “how are you going to control that?” Mr. Dumas replied “we have talked about several things, but most likely selling tickets would work best.”

Mr. Throop noted one establishment in town that has a limit of 99 people. “That would be Harlows” he said adding “often when they have a band, when it starts to fill up, they have someone at the door with a clicker to count the patrons coming in and leaving. I believe on occasion they will have a fire detail when they want to have a higher number of occupants.”

Ms. Von Mertens interjected “so 75 total or no more than 75 at a given time?” adding “as a Board you need to be clear about that.”

Ruth Holmes interjected “I would like to address one thing” as she described a garden function of a neighbor on Four Winds Farm Road earlier in the summer. “There were 500 people in a few hours on the road and there was no accounting for how that was done.” She went on to note they would do something similar to Harlow’s for crowd control. “There is a formula” she said adding “certainly we can figure something out” and suggested monitoring the number of cars.” Mr. Weeks replied a formula for people, not cars would be necessary. Mrs. Holmes replied “I know, but we would get an indication of when to start turning people away.”

Dan Holmes noted he had been to a number of farm events “and I don’t think that I have *ever* seen more than 75 people in attendance” adding an open farm event sponsored by the Rotary Cub (which Sunnyfield Farm has participated in) “peaked out with about 8 people.”

Jamie Trowbridge introduced himself as a resident of Cornish Road. “I have a unique perspective on the music” he said noting he had attended the wedding and as he waked home he could hear the music “but it wasn’t too loud and it got fainter and fainter as I walked down the road.” He went on to say “but I live on a hill and the wind carries the sound” adding “there are no trees around my house and I expect my neighbors (the Lefko Family) had the same experience.” He told the members that from his home location he could hear actually conversations “it is amazing how the sound carried” he said. Mr. Trowbridge then told the Board the noise was not objectionable to him “but I would urge the Board that if they approved the application that they do so with a condition that all amplified music be played indoors.”

Ms. Meiklejohn asked if she might go back to a point she had make earlier about the historical use of the farm. Mr. Weeks asked “is this getting back to a change in use?” Ms. Meiklejohn replied “well yes and no because it has not been addressed.” Mr. Spencer reiterated the many businesses (including a creamery, an apple business, a summer camp and event rentals for weddings and overnight stays) that the farm had been involved with. Ms. Meiklejohn interjected “but there were no neighbors then so no rights were being infringed on.” She went on to cite the two apartments in the Studio barn (one in one part of the ell and one in the other) stating “I don’t think the Board has considered the change of use of the building but that is what is happening. It is going from apartment to a wedding venue and across the street you have a barn yard going to a parking lot.”

Conrad Dumas stood and introduced himself. He told the members he and his wife were the proud parents of the applicant, Bryn Dumas. Mr. Dumas told the Board “I am also a seasoned town official having served Greenfield for many years” noting

his positions on the Planning Board, Zoning Board of Adjustment, Conservation Commission and former Selectman.

Mr. Dumas read a letter in which he encouraged the preservation of agricultural land and buildings as well as the agricultural operations described in RSA 21:34-a. He noted several general purpose farm, forestry, agricultural and educational uses and noted similar farm offerings from Silver Ranch in Jaffrey, Mayfair Farm in Harrisville, Stonewall Farm in Keene and Allyson's Orchards in Walpole.

Mr. Dumas told the members "the Monahan heirs have property rights at stake here" adding and they wish to fulfill Duffy's dream of returning the land to a functioning farm." He went on to say "we are sympathetic to the neighbors, but concerns need to be weighed with the owner's desires. This property has over 300 acres not the 3 required in the Rural District." He also noted his distress over his son, the Holmes and Monahan families being referred to as *outsiders*. "They are Peterborough residents and taxpayers and the only special interest they may have is to fulfill Duffy's dream of bringing the farm back" he said. **The full content of this letter is date-stamped 10-20-2014 and is filed with the application (ACUP-2014-01).**

Ms. Laurenitis asked for clarity on the hours of operation. She told the Board "7:00 to 10:00 is a huge time slot. It is unfair to the neighbors and it should be limited." She also asked for clarification of the noted RSA 21:34 and weddings falling under that RSA, not agritourism adding "there is no RSA 21:34." Mr. Weeks replied "I understand that, it was brought up at the last two meetings."

A brief back and forth about the permitted uses in the Rural District and where weddings fit in followed. Mr. Throop interjected "these comments sound like a challenge to the ordinance and that is not before this Board tonight" adding "the ordinance passed and it is now the law of the town, so at this point it is not a matter before you."

Sharon Monahan introduced herself and said "the town passed the ordinance using RSA 21:34 "and I think the point Loretta is making is that there isn't an RSA 21:34." Mr. Throop replied "that is correct, however the ordinance passed, it is the law of the town and the Board has an obligation to take up an application under it. Whether or not the RSA is valid is not before the Board tonight."

Rich Lefko introduced himself and said "I have been sitting and listening as this catering business continues to morph and evolve through the meetings." He asked "what else may they do? Bon fires? Racetracks?" adding "I am concerned with the parking and the traffic."

Tim Selby introduced himself and told the members he had attended the private event as well. "There was zero problems with parking" he said adding "and for hours of operation I think 10:00 is a good time." He went on to note most people had left by 9:30 "and the traffic issue was non-existent."

With regard to regulating the number of people at an event, Mr. Spencer gave several suggestions as to how regulate the numbers including parking lot allotment. He noted there would be no parking on the street and that potential customers in an overflow situation could be routed around the back of the Studio barn so that no one would be turning around in a neighbor's driveway. He also offered their property for off-street parking for other events in the neighborhood.

Ms. Von Mertens asked for clarification on the number of attendees at an event. She asked "is it 12 events of 75 people attending or 12 events with no more than 75 people attending at one time?" She went on to say "I'd like to ask the applicant what their intent was." Mr. Weeks replied "I can read the application one more time" adding "would you like to hear it again?" Ms. Von Mertens replied "no it is for you guys to figure out, I thought it was for 75 attendees total." Mr. Galus interjected "an event versus a progressive event."

Mr. Dumas replied he envisioned "a discrete event with a beginning and an end." Mr. Weeks noted "so the total number of people for an event is 75." Mr. Dumas replied "that is what was on my mind when filling out the application." Mr. Holmes interjected "the progressive event came out of discussion further in the process" adding "and that would work for an open house or an all-day event. It actually makes much more sense."

Ms. Cass voiced her concern about changing the hours of operation and when Mr. Clark warned against micro-managing the applicant Ms. Cass replied "that is an area of concern" adding "reducing the hours will make the event more easily trackable." Mr. Dumas reiterated the sale of tickets noting "for an event like a farm to table dinner that would work well." He also noted ways to create a formula for parking limits. "Two people in a car, each car requires 9 by 18 feet of space, just do the math."

Andrea Cadwell introduced herself and told the Board there were several on-line invitation programs that were available "where people accept the invitation and fill out a time slot for attendance." Rosaly's Matt Gifford said he thought the whole thing was being overcomplicated. "They are just trying to raise money for the farm" he said.

Ms. Meiklejohn asked for clarification noting that under the Conditional Use Permit the Board was subject to 674:21 and “the Planning Board is under obligation to be guided by the Master Plan (but) the Master Plan is completely silent on this issue of standards.”

Mrs. Holmes noted state-sponsored “open barn” days adding “we have done them at Sunnyfield Farm and never had more than 60 people throughout the whole day.”

With no more public input Mr. Weeks closed the public hearing at 8:00 p.m. and ordered a 5-minute recess.

At 8:08 p.m. the meeting resumed for Board discussion and deliberation. Mr. Weeks began with “keep in mind this is a closed hearing, there will be no more testimony.” He then looked around the table and asked “how do you want to proceed?” He went on to say “well first thing, do we have an idea of whether to deny or approve the application?” adding “I think we are hard-pressed to deny the application. They have met the standards in the ordinance voted in by the town and I think we are hard-pressed to deny it.” Mr. Zeller suggested a straw vote with each of the members agreeing the application be approved with conditions.

Mr. Weeks said “I have two things, the first being the fireworks. Should they be permitted?” Mr. Clark asked “Do we have any authority over that?” adding “to deny something that is legal?” Mr. Weeks replied “I think we do as it relates to this type of application. I am just one person though.” He went on to say “it would be possible to have fireworks for up to 16 events a year.” Ms. Cass interjected “with the hours of 7:00 to 10:00 I think that would be excessive.” Mr. Weeks continued “I would say weddings only and be done by the end of the event, with everything over and taken care of safely.” Mr. Weeks noted that during the first two meetings “fireworks were never discussed. Then they were displayed [at a private wedding] and that raises the question of whether or not they should be permitted.” He then questioned if fireworks were intended from the beginning.

Mr. Clark interjected “there are a thousand *what ifs* adding “*what if* they have a tractor pull, those are very loud, you can go down that road forever.” Mr. Weeks replied “so fireworks if they are limited to hours of operation and in accordance with the town’s noise ordinance.” Ms. Cass interjected “I am not comfortable with that, not for 16 events mostly within a very short period of time.” Mr. Galus noted his similar concern and agreed with Ms. Cass. Mr. Zeller asked “so weddings only?” After a brief discussion about the regulation of fireworks Mr. Galus noted “how about no fireworks at all” and asked Mr. Dumas “would you be willing to take fireworks off the table?” Mr. Dumas agreed to this request.

Mr. Weeks continued with his second concern “which is the 75 attendees.” He noted the question had become “is it 75 attendees for an event or 75 attendees on site at any one time spread over the hours of operation.” He explained the former “brings up an additional traffic concern.” Ms. Miller said “so the question is 75 attendees or 75 rolling attendees.” Mr. Weeks told the members “initially it was 75 total. I don’t know how you would keep track otherwise.” Mr. Clark noted “75 people per event is what they asked for.” Ms. Miller interjected “so take the rolling 75 off the table.” Mr. Clark replied “yes, they asked for 75 people per event.”

Ms. Miller interjected “I think reasonable conditions have been met and I am ready to vote.” Mr. Week and Mr. Clark both replied “we still have to talk about the hours of operation.” Mr. Weeks went on to say “I see a concern with the event lasting to 10:00 p.m.” He noted the lingering that may occur at the close of an event may in fact not totally clear the area until about 11:00 p.m. He looked up and asked “was the intent that the people be off the site at 10:00 or the event ended at 10:00?” Mr. Zeller noted “I think the intent was that the people be off the premises by 10:00 p.m. as long as they are all *gone* by 10:00” with Mr. Weeks replying “so the hours are 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.” The members then briefly discussed the amplified music being indoors with Mr. Weeks stating “I am ready to read a motion with related conditions that we can discuss one at a time.” The members agreed and Mr. Weeks did just that.

“APPROVE the granting of a conditional use permit for Dancing Ground Farm LLC at 149 Four Winds Farm Road, Parcel ID# R004-032-000 and R004-013-000, to permit a maximum of 4 single day events for up to 175 attendees including staff and service providers and to permit an additional 12 single day events per year with no more than 75 attendees including staff and service providers, such events limited to weddings, farm to table dinners, seasonal farm events and educational events subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed use shall be in compliance with the plan by Dancing Ground Farm LLC entitled Site Plan Conditional Use Permit for Proposed Agricultural Business Enterprise dated August 18, 2014, last revision date September 28, 2014 and as amended by this motion.
2. All existing buffering and screening of parking and events on parcels R004-013-00 and R004-032-000 shall remain natural and undisturbed unless further approved by the Planning Board.
3. All parking shall be provided onsite with no parking permitted on Four Winds Farm Road for all attendees and event staff.
4. A parking attendant(s) shall be provided to direct traffic to the approved parking to ensure that there is adequate off-street parking and that the Fire Department can access the site if necessary.
5. Hours of operation for all events shall be between the hours of 7:00 AM and 9:00 PM.

6. All amplified live or prerecorded music shall be located inside the building with the exception of wedding procession music on parcel R004-013-000.
7. Noise including but not limited to live or prerecorded music shall comply with section 245-33C of the Peterborough Zoning Ordinance. Please also note that any noise that would disturb a person of average sensibilities may be in violation of NH RSA 644:2.
8. All live or recorded music shall be limited to and accessory to the weddings and farm to table dinner uses permitted by this permit.
9. The applicant shall obtain approval from the Fire Department Chief and the Code Enforcement Officer for Fire and Building Code related issues for the proposed assembly occupancy of the buildings prior to the first event.
10. Proposed portable toilets are to include handicap accessible toilets. Proposed plan is to be amended to show the relocation of the proposed handicap accessible portable toilets prior to signing of the plan.
11. Until such time as an automatic fire sprinkler and fire alarm system is installed and approved by the Fire Department, all events in the building with more than 99 occupants shall be supervised by a Fire Department detail. The cost of the detail shall be at the applicant's expense and the amount of Fire Department personal and equipment required for the detail shall be determined by the Peterborough Fire Department.
12. All onsite and offsite signage for this use shall comply with the sign ordinance regulated by section 245-18 of the Peterborough Zoning Ordinance.
13. On-site directional signs to be provided on parcel R004-032-000 directing attendees to the parking as well as the entrance and exit of the parking area. A plan of the location and size of the proposed directional signs to be submitted and approved by the Code Enforcement Officer prior to signing of the plan.
14. The serving of alcohol shall be consistent with state law for all events.
15. Fireworks shall not be permitted for any event allowed under this permit."

It was noted that the application did not specify one way or the other what the educational events would be relevant to. Mr. Galus noted he assumed that they would be relevant to farming noting "we have talked about it before, I just always assumed they were." Mr. Weeks suggested adding "agricultural related" to educational events.

Mr. Clark challenged that action and asked "are you going to change their application?" Mr. Weeks replied he was cementing the condition that the educational events be relevant or related to agriculture. Mr. Throop interjected "this is raising a little bit of a question in my mind. While this change adds clarity, I'm not sure it provides any more protection in relation to potential impacts." Suggested "if you want to go in this direction, you may wish to reopen the public hearing to address this question with the applicant." Ms. Miller asked "do you see any value in adding this? I see none, let's take it out." The other members agreed with Ms. Miller.

A motion was made/seconded (Weeks/Clark) to approve the Conditional Use Permit request by Dancing Ground Farm with conditions as previously reviewed. The motion passed on a vote of 5 to 1 with Mr. Weeks, Mr. Galus, Mr. Zeller, Ms. Miller, and Mr. Clark in favor, and Ms. Cass was opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant