7/10/18

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Peter Hogan. Present were regular Board members Mark Suennen, Ed Carroll and David Litwinovich, Selectman Ex-Officio Christine Quirk (sitting in for Rodney Towne), and Alternate member Amy Sanders.

Also present were Planning Coordinator Shannon Silver, Planning Board Assistant Nadine Scholes and Planning Consultant Mark Fougere.

Present in the audience for all or part of the meeting were Robert Kilmer and Steven and Lisa Burgess.

DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO (OWNER) Adjourned from June 26, 2018 SANDFORD SURVEYING & ENGINEERING, INC. (APPLICANT)

Public Hearing/Major Subdivision/4 Lots

15 Location: Christie and Roby Roads

Tax Map/Lot #12/52

Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District

Robert Kilmer explained the 30+ acre lot would be subdivided into 4 lots, creating 3 new building lots and the remainder would be left with 11 acres and the existing house. The site walk was conducted on June 27, 2018, and he was waiting to hear back on what was agreed upon between the Road Agent and the developer for the driveways.

Robert Kilmer noted that due to the steep slopes each lot required an Individual Stormwater Management Plan. He noted that the Board had given the drainage report that was submitted to the Town Engineer to review. Peter Hogan said the Town Engineer had not provided his review of the drainage report yet and the Road Agent could not attend the meeting tonight. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, noted that the Road Agent would be asked to attend the meeting on August 14, 2018, to provide his input.

Peter Hogan said there were several questions from the site walk and thought Amy Sanders would be better to ask the questions regarding the drainage. Peter Hogan said that he had concerns of the water draining out of the sides of the stonewall verses properly draining through the detention ponds where they were proposed to be installed. He also questioned why the existing stonewall would not just be removed. It was spotty as it existed today and more of it would be removed for the driveways, he believed it would be easier and more valuable to remove it altogether.

Robert Kilmer said there are State RSAs that require stonewalls be preserved if possible. He also noted that the stonewalls were a distinct property line between the Town owned portion of the lots. He noted that some areas of the stonewalls would need to be removed for construction of the driveways and drainage.

7/10/18

DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

Amy Sanders said that she would rather not see the stonewalls removed, the Town may want to ask that they be rebuilt in the sections that have fallen to keep the rural character of the Town. She continued that as long as the stonewalls were not going to be used as a detention wall, she wouldn't expect water to leak out the sides.

Amy Sanders expressed that her biggest concern would be the 1:1 slopes. She was curious what Northpoint's input would be in regards to the Stormwater plans with the steep slopes and drainage.

Peter Hogan noted that as-built plans would not be accepted for this development. Mark Suennen clarified that if the as-built plans were different than what was originally submitted and approved by the Board that would not be accepted.

Amy Sanders asked where the snow would be stored on the properties in the winter. The plans did not have an area shown on the lots for snow storage.

Amy Sanders referred to the email that the Road Agent had sent regarding the driveways and she wanted to clarify what the comment 'the driveway should start at the stone wall and not the edge of the road' meant. Mark Suennen noted he had questioned this comment also. Robert Kilmer believed the negative grade would need to be at the ditch line with the same grade to the edge of the right of way and start the driveway slope up at the stonewall. The Board would need the Road Agent to clarify what this meant. There are future plans to widen Christie Road and he could want the driveways to start at the stonewall for that reason.

Mark Fougere recommended that it would be a good idea to have the Road Agent clarify what he wanted for the driveways and discuss that with the engineer to update the plans sooner rather than later. The Town Engineer would be reviewing the plans and it would be pointless to have him review them and then change them.

Peter Hogan asked if the driveway permits had been submitted. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, said yes and the Road Agent had already approved them.

Peter Hogan asked if the Board had any further questions or comments.

Mark Suennen said aside from the discussion with the Road Agent on how far the drive-ways would need to be chased back, he recommended that the stonewalls should be preserved as much as feasible but the Board could not make any firm decisions without the Road Agent explaining exactly how far back the grade would need to be chased into the slope for the driveway entry's.

Peter Hogan asked Christine Quirk if she was familiar with the application. She said that Rodney Towne had contacted her to get her up to speed and he had mentioned that he was also concerned with the drainage off the lots.

7/10/18

DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

Mark Suennen opened the hearing for public input.

Steven and Lisa Burgess said they are across from the worst lot with the most excavation and with the existing issues they just want to make sure the construction doesn't make the runoff worse than it already is. Mark Suennen asked the Burgess' to point out which lot was their lot. Steven and Lisa Burgess said they wanted to be present because the runoff is really a huge concern and with all the drainage being proposed on private property the Town would have no control over if the property owners maintained the drainage systems. Steve Burgess noted that he thought the Board had the same concerns and liked the discussions.

Mark Suennen said the Board could assure that the requirement for the developer is that no additional water can flow off the property onto the roadway than is currently coming off the natural slope. That is why ISWMPs had been submitted and have detention ponds to collect the water and infiltrate it before it flows over the land.

Lisa Burgess had concerns that the drainage systems could end up not working after construction was complete.

Lisa Burgess also noted that she would be concerned that the snow is plowed onto the street. Christine Quirk said that plowing onto the Town road was not allowed and if that were to happen, they should not hesitate to call it in. Mark Suennen noted that it was discussed during the site walk that the driveway should be widened at the throat for snow storage.

Mark Suennen asked if the Board could make any motions at the meeting tonight.

Robert Kilmer noted that no waivers had been requested because all the required items had been submitted.

Peter Hogan noted that there would be another meeting before the Board's deadline of August 30, 2018.

David Litwinovich asked the Planning Coordinator if Kevin Leonard would be present at the August 14, 2018, meeting. She replied that she would request that he attended that meeting.

Ed Carroll asked if the questions the Board had could be provided to Kevin Leonard prior to the meeting and he can provide his response. Mark Suennen noted that would be difficult since the questions would come up at the discussion at the next meeting. The Board suggested that Kevin Leonard could be conference called into the meeting.

Peter Hogan noted that the meeting would be adjourned if the Board did not have anything else to discuss. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, noted that the hearing would be adjourned to August 14, 2018, at 6:30 p.m.

7/10/18

DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to adjourn to August 14, 2018, at 6:30 p.m. Ed Carroll seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

Continued Discussion, re: Revisions and/or Additions to Master Plan Draft

Mark Suennen said he had reviewed David Litwinovich's edited version of the Master Plan and had some items that he would not want to delete.

Mark Fougere noted he had been looking into the Impact Fee Ordinance, which the Board would have a draft to review by the next meeting but noted that it reflects 'based on recommendation in the Master Plan' and re-emphasized that certain statements should be kept within the Master Plan. Mark Suennen clarified that historically statistics would be important to keep in the Master Plan to support the changes that may occur over the next several years. Mark Fougere agreed.

 David Litwinovich asked if the statistics could be included in the Master Plan appendix. Mark Fougere said some things could be put in the appendix. Mark Suennen said the Board could decide as the Master Plan is being reviewed. Mark Suennen believed some of the text would support some of the graphs and some of the graphs would support the text.

The Board went over the items that should be kept, moved to the appendix and removed from the Master Plan.

On page 10 – keep 2^{nd} paragraph under population and the table under historical trends can be moved to appendix.

Ed Carroll suggested that the line graph be removed and the numbers table be kept instead. In his opinion the line graph does not give as much information as the numbers table. David Litwinovich said the line graph was kept because it would be understood by more of a percentage of the population. Mark Fougere said the table could be in the appendix but the line graph would be easier to understand. Ed Carroll opined the line graph does not tell as much, all it shows is Bedford is growing the fastest.

On page 11 - Mark Suennen noted to keep 1^{st} paragraph and add paragraph to explain Table 2.

On page 13 – Mark Suennen noted to keep 1st and 2nd paragraph under Population Projections.

On page 15 - Mark Suennen noted he was good with removing data filled paragraph but replace with 'when compared with surrounding Towns, New Boston housing stock growth

7/10/18

Continued Discussion, re: Revisions and/or Additions to Master Plan Draft, cont.

follows the trend in population growth, with New Boston right behind Bedford'. Ed Carroll said to add 'in single family house' at the end of the statement. Mark Suennen said he was okay with that being added.

Ed Carroll asked Mark Suennen if he was good with all the Workforce Housing updates. Mark Suennen said yes. Ed Carroll agreed.

On page 21 – Mark Suennen noted to keep from 'the first floor to the Recreation Department'. Mark Suennen noted he would be okay with deleting how many employees. Ed Carroll asked if the hours of operation should be kept. Mark Suennen replied that would not be necessary.

On page 23 & 24 – Mark Suennen noted to keep the last paragraph all the way through to page 24. Mark Fougere believed this information would be vital to keep in the Master Plan for instituting Impact Fees.

Ed Carroll wanted to discuss a study done by SNHPC regarding Impact Fees for various uses for the Town for 2008-2013, which at the time the study states it was on the CIP. Did anything every come of that or did that get shut down? Mark Suennen and Christine Quirk both were unsure of what Ed Carroll was referring too. He said the SNHPC had done a study in 2008 of the feasibility of Impact Fees and looked at various things. He read off the statement for the Fire Department. He noted that he would forward the document to the other Board members. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, and David Litwinovich said there are many factors to institute a project into the CIP but the new Fire Station has been on the schedule, just had been voted down by the residents and that would need to pass prior to starting the collection of funds. Mark Suennen said that is why it was important to adopt the Impact Fee Ordinance first. The Board could not start collection of funds without an Ordinance in place. Ed Carroll said he was suggesting this be reviewed in terms of #1 had to do with the new Fire Station and #2 talking about Impact Fees and how they might be assessed. The document might shed some light on the discussion.

Mark Suennen continued with the Master Plan discussion. On page 25 – Keep the end of the 1st paragraph, starting at 'Even if residential all the way through to the 2nd paragraph. And then under Cisterns keep the 2nd paragraph that continued on page 26.

On page 27 – Mark Suennen noted to keep all the information under the Transfer Station section.

On page 28 – Mark Suennen noted to keep all the information under the School Department but the last sentence in the 1st paragraph, and under School Enrollments, keep that paragraph.

7/10/18

Continued Discussion, re: Revisions and/or Additions to Master Plan Draft, cont.

2 3 4

1

On page 29 – Mark Suennen noted to keep the last sentence in the paragraph under the table.

5 6

7

8

9

Ed Carroll said that given the fact that the cost of sending kids to middle and high school usually, or typically, or historically, seems to be the most expensive portion of the school budget to educating students in the Town, should that be capsulated within the Master Plan or does it not matter? Mark Suennen said he was open to adding something but how. It would be pointless to put the cost from 2008 because it would mean nothing in 2018-2019.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28 29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

Ed Carroll said he was thinking more along the line of a bird's eye view, something generic that since New Boston is a fellow member of the SAU and we send students to their schools, historically the cost of sending our students to their middle and high schools at whatever percentage going to use is much higher than it is to educate members of the lower grades in local schools. He continued that it could be something general so your not getting into, well this year its \$12k and in 5 years its going to be \$15k. Mark Suennen asked if Ed Carroll was suggesting adding the cost ratio between what educating an elementary student cost verses a middle and high school would cost into the Master Plan. Ed Carroll said he was willing to back off on it; he was only making a suggestion. Mark Suennen noted that he would be willing to read it, if Ed Carroll wanted to write it up. Peter Hogan was unsure where the figures would come from and if they would be accurate. Ed Carroll said he didn't care about the numbers being accurate. Christine Quirk thought this might cause a disturbance in the publics' eye and make people start to think that New Boston should consider building their own schools without realizing how high the cost is to put together a middle and high school. Ed Carroll said he believed the taxpayers have had their heads in the sand, where taxes came from. Peter Hogan asked Ed Carroll if he was referring to where taxes go or where they came from. Ed Carroll continued that even in an article in the Beacon, he read that the Chief of the Police Department had noted the Master Plan from 2006. Even though one of the Board members say that in theory the Master Plan had no teeth, and it may just be for unicorns and rainbows, he believed it is something people do read and the Board could use it to educate people to understand what is driving the taxes being at the rate they are. Ed Carroll asked the Board if they think this is something worth while to include in the Master Plan. He also mentioned that Rodney Towne had told him a story recently that he had a neighbor who bought a house and he was asking when the road would be paved and when would the street lights be put in, that is just not the way it is in New Boston and this gentleman clearly had no clue as to what this was all about and if he were to read the Master Plan he would have a better idea of what it is truly about and what to expect and what you should not expect. Again he wasn't sure if the Board felt this should be encapsulated. David Litwinovich agreed with Mark Suennen, if Ed Carroll wanted to write up something the Board would consider adding it. Ed Carroll said he would be willing to write it but would the Board feel it would even be worth it or not. Mark Suennen thought it would be important to explain what decisions taxpayers make have an effect on the taxes they pay. He thought what Ed Carroll had described would be a great addition to include in the introduction of the Master Plan. Ed Carroll said he thought this could help attract the right kind of people to New Boston, to appreciate the Town for it's rural

7/10/18

Continued Discussion, re: Revisions and/or Additions to Master Plan Draft, cont. character. Peter Hogan opined that he doesn't believe that most people that planned on moving

into New Boston would just read the Master Plan before moving. Christine Quirk agreed. Ed Carroll said that he thought the Master Plan should incorporate the flavor of the Town and he would write up something and send out to the Board.

Mark Suennen continued with his updates to the Master Plan, on page 30 – under the Recreation Department, he would like to keep the 3rd & 5th paragraphs. David Litwinovich asked if the dugouts that were recently completed would qualify as the improvements listed in the Master Plan. Mark Suennen said if that was what they planned for the improvements and they are in fact complete, the statement in paragraph 5 could be removed. Amy Sanders thought the baseball fields meant the fields up by the Transfer Station, not the Recreation baseball fields. Mark Fougere said he would verify which were the baseball fields before removing the statement.

 On page 31 – Mark Suennen suggested deleting the entire paragraph under Town Cemetery. On page 31, under the Highway Department, Mark Suennen would like to keep the last sentence of the 1st paragraph and keep the 5th and 6th paragraph. Then still under Highway, but continued onto page 32, Mark Suennen would like to delete the last sentence of the first paragraph, and in the 2nd to last paragraph, keep from the 3rd sentence, 'Road maintenance projects, on through to the end of that paragraph. Also on page 32, move Table 15 and the paragraph above the table with explanation to the appendix.

On page 33 – under Transportation, Mark Suennen would like to keep the 1st paragraph and delete the sentence left in the 2nd paragraph. Then on page 34, Mark Suennen would like to keep Table 17, but it could be moved to the appendix.

 Ed Carroll noted that in Table 17, 2nd NH Turnpike was referenced as Francetown Turnpike, which does not exist in New Boston, it changes to 2nd NH Turnpike once you cross over the town line. Mark Fougere and the Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, explained that the information included in the table comes from a report that Southern New Hampshire Planning had done and they would need to update it on their end. Mark Fougere noted that he would have SNHPC fix this information.

Mark Suennen said all the accident statistics from page 34 through 38 should be moved to the appendix.

Mark Suennen said the first paragraph should be kept to explain the 7 bullet items that are under Chapter 7, East New Boston Neighborhood Plan because all the explanations under the 7 items had been deleted. Ed Carroll thought there to be some value in keeping some explanation under each of the bullets. Mark Suennen said the justifications could be moved to the appendix. Amy Sanders believed it would a good idea to keep some type of explanation under each bullet item verses moving the full explanations to the appendix. Ed Carroll said he would be willing to condense the explanations for each bullet item if the Board wished. Mark Suennen and David

7/10/18

Continued Discussion, re: Revisions and/or Additions to Master Plan Draft, cont.

2 3 4

1

Litwinovich said they would be willing to look at the shortened explanations for each bulleted item.

5 6

7

Mark Suennen gave his edits to Mark Fougere. Mark Fougere noted that he would merge Mark Suennen's updates into the document with the track changes and wait for Ed Carroll to provide his edits.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

Ed Carroll noted that he found another article on the SNHPC website in regards to an assessment done for New Boston, in terms of being age friendly. He thought it was interesting and could be incorporated into the Master Plan. He read a few of the bullets in regards to housing and transportation from the article. He said he would send it the Board to review and decide what would be important to add into the Master Plan. He continued that he thought he had explained the importance of housing diversity before but maybe he wasn't clear that there would be value in having more of a housing diversity within the Town. David Litwinovich believed that the Board attempted and had taken the steps to encourage other types of housing by adding the Elderly Housing Chapter within the Zoning Ordinance but there hasn't been anyone beating down the door interested in developing this type of housing. Ed Carroll said that he was gearing at a comment made by a New Boston resident within the article that stated 'there is a lack of rental units in town, it's very hard to find an affordable unit in town.' He was unsure on what the appropriate options would be for the town but he said he had thought that the 2 acre minimum lot size could be changed in Zoning to help encourage more rental type housing. He continued that the article also states 'in the last 5 years mostly single family homes have been built and since 2009 New Boston had allowed ADUs for the purpose of providing expanded affordable housing units, including rental potential and providing flexibility in household arrangements.' Ed Carroll noted that he was unsure how many people had taken advantage of that but he thought this to be similar to the definition of insanity, banging your head against the wall and expecting different results. He said at this point, New Boston only encourages single and 2-family homes, is there capacity to encourage other types of housing in certain areas of town. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, explained that currently in the Residential-Agricultural "R-A" district, single and 2-family homes are allowed, so the potential for duplex type units is available and attached or detached accessory dwelling units are allowed within the R-A district also. She assumed Ed Carroll was referring to multi-family type housing, which is allowed but only in the Residential-One "R-1" district and there is limited "R-1" zoned lots. She continued that the only option to add more potential options would be to rezone other areas or allow multi-family units in other districts. She noted that in New Boston, it was difficult to offer rental development opportunities because of the limited resources, i.e. no public water supply or sewer, public transportation, hospital. Ed Carroll said that the article mentions that the minimum lot size requirement is what causes this issue. He continued that other town's are working towards tax stabilization because the taxes have gone too high because of various things those towns have done. Ed Carroll said the Master Plan to him, even though it had no teeth, was a way to say we realize what is going on here and here is what we see potentially for the future. Even though New Boston may be heading down a path no where close to what is expected the Town to look like in 10 years. Peter

7/10/18

1 Continued Discussion, re: Revisions and/or Additions to Master Plan Draft, cont. 2 Hogan said that most of the Board members are in favor of sprawl. Ed Carroll said that he had 3 found it interesting when the Board had discussed the potential future uses for the Tracking Sta-4 tion, he had suggested that he would be in favor of a non-town maintained recreational park, 5 which he noted that had never made it into the minutes, but for some reason it did make the min-6 utes that he was in favor of a large Commercial district. He said he remembered from that meet-7 ing, most of the Board was in favor that some of the Tracking Station be commercialized. He 8 said was unsure what makes it into the minutes. Ed Carroll noted that he was not in favor of 9 sprawl but the fact is development is part of life and although it cannot be stopped, but hopefully 10 the Board could guide it. Peter Hogan questioned if Ed Carroll was sure that he did not favor 11 sprawl. Ed Carroll replied that he felt this to be a conversation that would be better to have out-12 side of a meeting. Peter Hogan asked how many acres was the lot that Ed Carroll lived on. He 13 replied the standard, 2.5 acres. Peter Hogan explained that most people believe sprawl is some-14 thing opposite than what it actually is. If you were to have 20 houses on a 10 acre lot, that prop-15 erty would cost the taxpayers more than if it only had 5 houses on it. Mostly because there 16 would be more kids going to the school and each kid in the school system costs money to the 17 taxpayers. Peter Hogan noted that sprawling is when a smaller quantity of homes are spread out 18 on that lot. Mark Suennen noted that changing the minimum lot size requirement does not 19 change the nature of what is built on that lot, the builder can still build a huge house on a smaller 20 sized lot. Ed Carroll said he was not an expert on Zoning laws but he was thinking more along 21 the lines of changing the stuff that would allow for more rental type housing being developed on 22 smaller lots. Mark Suennen mentioned that the Board also had designated larger COM zones for 23 future use in the Master Plan, which is another way to get away from taxes increasing. Ed Car-24 roll suggested that what Mark Suennen just explained should be somehow captured in the Master 25 Plan because people view all business development as bad. Christine Ouirk agreed that many 26 people in Town are against business growth. Ed Carroll remembered something that had failed 27 Town Vote that would give businesses a tax incentive to expand an existing business. He con-28 tinued it was a shame, maybe it was a lack of knowledge or fear of something big coming in like 29 a Walmart or Starbucks, which was not in the character of the Town but a campground, or some 30 type of entrepreneur type driven business, as Peter Hogan had put in one of the recent minutes, about an incubator and by the way, the May 22nd minutes, there was a whole discussion about an 31 32 incubator that Peter Hogan had brought up about businesses expanding, and at the end it states 33 that Mark Suennen and David Litwinovich agreed, he said he had also agreed but that did not 34 make the minutes. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, told Ed Carroll that if there is 35 ever an issue with the minutes, he could email her or bring up his concerns when the Board is 36 reviewing them for approval. Ed Carroll said he was familiar with transcribing minutes and how 37 difficult it could be. He was not trying to be critical, he was only trying to clarify what he 38 thought was said. Peter Hogan continued that he believed the Board would not disagree that it is 39 important to get more commercial businesses but a lot of developers do not want to even enter-40 tain it. Ed Carroll asked if the Board could do more within the Master Plan to attract more busi-41 nesses to come to New Boston. Ed Carroll said he would write up something to present to the 42 Board. 43

7/10/18

Miscellaneous Business and correspondence for the meeting of July 10, 2018, including, but not limited to:

1. Approval of the May 8, 2018, meeting minutes, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

Ed Carroll asked to clarify how he should handle if he had something missing from the minutes, should he send an email or discuss during the meetings. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, said that it could be done either by email or he can mark up the minutes and bring to discuss at the meeting. Either way the Board would need to review and approve any changes. Ed Carroll said that up to this point he was reluctant on saying anything about the content in the minutes. David Litwinovich said that proper grammar is also important in the minutes but he believed content would be the most important piece. Peter Hogan believed it was very difficult to transcribe what the Board says during the meetings. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, believed that the Planning Board minutes have always had tons of content, and she preferred them that way, especially because minutes could be used in court hearings. She said that if any of the Board members find that there is something missing in the minutes they should bring it to her attention.

Ed Carroll **MOVED** to approve the May 8, 2018, meeting minutes, with changes. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

2. Distribution of the May 22, 2018, meeting minutes, for approval, at the August 14, 2018, meeting, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

3. Distribution of the June 12, 2018, meeting minutes, for approval, at the August 14, 2018, meeting, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

4. Discussion, with Planning Coordinator, re: 461 Weare Road, Tax Map/Lot #2/25, potential Lot Line Adjustment.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, explained that Larry Houghton, owner of Tax Map/Lot #2/25, had stopped by the Planning Department to discuss what his options were to give a portion of his lot to the PLC and sell the remainder with the existing house. She continued that Tax Map/Lot #2/25, has plenty of frontage on Middle Branch Road, but because of the river, to access the lot off of the frontage it would be expensive, if even possible. Currently this lot has an existing access easement through Tax Map/Lot #2/112, which was previously owned by Larry's Stepmom, Kathy Houghton. Mark Suennen asked where was the existing access. The Planning Coordinator replied that the lot shared a curb cut with Tax Map/Lot #2/112, off of Weare Road, which is State Road, and the driveway continued through the back of that lot to access Tax Map/Lot #2/25.

7/10/18

Miscellaneous Business and correspondence, cont.

The Planning Coordinator believed that Larry Houghton could submit the application as a Lot Line Adjustment because the PLC owned the abutting lot to the east and would the Board accept 50' of frontage leaving enough acreage for a backlot or would the Board prefer the lot to have 200' of frontage. Larry expressed the PLC would like to protect as much of the river along Middle Branch as possible.

Mark Suennen mentioned that if this parcel were to be subdivided, the Board would require proof that a driveway could be built on the frontage, which is not possible for this lot. He continued that with this particular situation, where there is an existing access and the owner is willing to give a portion of his land to conservation, he would be in favor of allowing a Lot Line Adjustment, and only 50' of frontage would be necessary. The Planning Coordinator noted that there would be no new lots created, it simply would be moving a property line to give a portion of the land he owned to the abutting property currently owned by the PLC. Christine Quirk clarified that the remainder could not be subdivided again in the future if it were left with 50' of frontage. The Planning Coordinator agreed.

Mark Suennen opined that the application could be accepted if submitted as a Lot Line Adjustment and he would be in favor of 50' frontage left with enough acreage for a backlot, and a portion of the lot would be given to conservation. Peter Hogan stated that he preferred 50' opposed to 200'.

Mark Suennen wanted to clarify that the existing access for Tax Map/Lot #2/25, did have an easement existing for the rights to cross over Tax Map/Lot #2/112. The Planning Coordinator answered that there is an access easement noted in Larry Houghton's Warranty deed but with the recent sale of Tax Map/Lot #2/112, the easement did not transfer to the new deed for that lot. They are in the process of legally fixing that now. Mark Suennen noted that would be a title issue and he would suggest that would be a condition of approval if it were not fixed by that time. The Planning Coordinator agreed. She explained that this was just discovered when Larry decided to give a portion of his land to the PLC. The Planning Coordinator noted that she had advised Larry to have that resolved and finalized prior to submitting the Lot Line Adjustment application. The Board agreed.

5b. Letter copy, dated July 6, 2018, from Sylvia von Aulock, Executive Director, Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission, to the Town of Weare Planning Board Chairman, Craig A. Francisco, re: Whitetail Commercial Development Traffic Impact Assessment review comments, for the Board's information.

Mark Suennen noted that he had not seen this document yet but he had attended the Planning Board meeting and the Board is still in review of the application.

6. Letter received July 9, 2018, from Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission, re: SNHPC Membership Dues for 2018-2019 Fiscal Year, for the Board's information.

7/10/18 Miscellaneous Business and correspondence, cont. 1 2 3 The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, noted that the total dues had gone up roughly 4 \$50 from the year before. 5 6 David Litwinovich **MOVED** to adjourn the meeting at 8:09 7 p.m. Ed Carroll seconded the motion and it PASSED unani-8 mously. 9 10 Respectfully submitted, 11 Minutes Approved: 09/11/18 12 Nadine Scholes, Planning Board Assistant