8/14/18

1 2

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Vice Chairman Mark Suennen. Present were Chairman Peter Hogan, regular Board members Ed Carroll and David Litwinovich, Selectman Ex-Officio 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 was Earl Sandford, Road Agent Dick Perusse, Town Engineer Kevin Leonard and abutters Matthew and Kelly Kennerson.

# DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO (OWNER) SANDFORD SURVEYING & ENGINEERING, INC. (APPLICANT) Adjourned from July 10, 2018

14 Public Hearing/Major Subdivision/4 Lots

15 Location: Christie and Roby Roads

16 Tax Map/Lot #12/52

Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District

Earl Sandford presented the proposed 4-lot subdivision, which would create 3 new building lots. He noted a site walk was conducted on June 27, 2018, and was waiting to hear what was agreed upon between the Road Agent and the developer regarding the collaboration for future road improvements to widen Christie Road.

Earl Sandford noted he had revised the Individual Stormwater Management Plans. He continued that development was difficult because of the steep slopes and each lot would have at least 20' of back yard with a 1:1 engineered slope. The details were added to the plan to keep the 1:1 slopes stable. He noted that the Board had questioned if a wetland existed along the road ditch line but that was an error. He clarified that there are existing wetlands on the lots but not along the road and the proposed development would not impact the wetlands on the lots.

Earl Sandford explained that the new design shown on the revised plans would allow for future plans to widen Christie Road. The design for the location of the homes would be driven by the septic systems on all 3 lots. The locations of the homes were shifted for adequate runoff that is 2' deeper than originally designed. The shift of the homes decreases the driveway platforms to 20' to not encroach on the wetland setback but the platforms would still be adequate before entering the garage.

Earl Sandford said there maybe a few tweaks on the ISWMP plans once construction starts. The driveways would require removing some trees and earth for adequate site distance, which was agreed upon with the Road Agent. Peter Hogan asked if the shift of the anticipated road centerline would require the stonewall to be removed. Earl Sandford said no. Peter Hogan asked the Road Agent if he thought the stonewalls should be preserved. The Road Agent noted that he had requested the 6' shift for the future plans to widen the road but the construction would not impact the stonewall. Peter Hogan opined that the stonewall as it existed was falling

8/14/18

#### DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

apart and for the sake of a better design he believed it should be removed to not obstruct construction of the proposed drainage. Rodney Towne noted that stonewalls along roadways are property lines between property owners and the Town's ROW. Only a few feet would be gained if the stonewalls were removed.

Earl Sandford noted that some of the stonewall would be removed for the construction of the driveways but explained that no slopes would be steeper than what existed with the design proposed. He explained that this design was similar to another project on McCurdy Road that held up nicely and that area had similar slopes. Amy Sanders asked Earl Sandford if he could point out any area of stonewall that would have impacts on construction. Earl Sandford noted that if the stonewall were to be removed the proposed berm that would be installed behind the stonewall would need to be redesigned. Amy Sanders and Mark Suennen asked Earl Sandford if the stonewalls were helping in the design for drainage. Earl Sandford noted that the stonewalls were helpful & used for the design. If the stonewall were to be completely removed the slope would need to be graded further back and that would only disturb more of an area that would need to be stabilized. Mark Suennen opined that he would rather keep as much of the stonewall as possible.

Earl Sandford said the design could be revised as needed and any field improvements could be reviewed and agreed upon with the Road Agent. Peter Hogan said he preferred to see the as-built plans as similar as possible to the proposed design.

Amy Sanders asked Earl Sandford if there would be a wetland impact to the left of the house on lot 12/52-2. Earl Sandford said he had moved the house location to not have an impact on the wetlands but had forgot to move back the riprap when the house was moved.

Amy Sanders asked if there would need to be swales at the top of all the 1:1 boulder slopes. Earl Sandford replied that only lot 12/52-2 would need the diversion swale at the top of the 1:1 boulder slope because it was the steepest of the lots.

Amy Sanders requested that the Owner's Inspection & Maintenance Manual be simplified to help homeowners understand the document and a Manual provided for each lot with the specific details for the structures installed on that lot. Mark Suennen agreed with Amy Sanders' request and noted that the Manual submitted showed details for a detention pond with a 6' to 8' deep pool which none of the plans showed for the 3 lots. David Litwinovich had concerns with property owners not maintaining the drainage systems regularly which could have impacts on the road and that would end up being the Town's problem to fix. Rodney Towne believed that would be a legal ramification and the Town could hold the property owner responsible if they do not maintain the drainage systems on their property. Peter Hogan said this was not included anywhere on the plans and suggested this could be noted right on the front page of the Manuals. Earl Sandford said he would add that as a note and the language could be reviewed.

8/14/18

#### DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

Mark Suennen noted that Kevin Leonard had submitted his review comments but he would like Kevin Leonard to highlight the items that the Board should address with Earl Sandford. Kevin Leonard stated most of the items were small housekeeping corrections, which had already been addressed tonight. The first item he would highlight was a potential wetland impact on Lot 12/52-3, to the right of the driveway, that tied into the granite bound, the plan showed that area would be cut into to achieve the driveway site distance and may require a permit. Earl Sandford believed that was identified incorrectly on the plan and he would need to review that again.

 Kevin Leonard noted that he had discussed the berm shown to be installed along the stonewall with the Road Agent. They did not believe the stonewall would be adequate and stable to use for a reliable tie-in drainage structure. Earl Sandford replied that this berm may need to be shifted up the hill more and he would be willing to work more on the detail for that detention basin. Mark Suennen asked Earl Sandford if shifting the berm up the hill more meant the base would be widened. Earl Sandford replied no, he would work on moving it further away from the wall but it would stay the same width. He continued that the calculations for volume would need to be maintained.

Kevin Leonard noted that he had left a few items from his last review because he was unsure of how to apply the regulations to the situation of the infiltration structures proposed on private property that would not be maintained by the Town. Mark Suennen noted the Board usually did not require these public style drainage structures on private property for Stormwater Management. It would be more difficult for a homeowner to maintain these kinds of structures.

Kevin Leonard suggested that he would recommend the Town request a 10' easement along the road to accommodate future roadwork. Mark Suennen asked the Road Agent if he intended to propose a drainage easement with the plans to widen Christie Road. The Road Agent noted that the final design is not complete but at this point they do not include any easements. He continued that a survey was completed for a 10-year plan and with the proposed subdivision he was trying to look forward on the plans to widen Christie Road. Mark Suennen asked the Road Agent if he would anticipate a need for an easement for additional R.O.W. on the lots to maintain the road. The Road Agent replied no.

Amy Sanders noted that the R.O.W. was found to not be the standard 50' along the entire road. Kevin Leonard explained that he had found a few spots that were less than the 50' but not less than 47' when he scaled the R.O.W. Earl Sandford noted that he did not find any areas to be less than 50' along the R.O.W. when he had scaled it. Rodney Towne believed one spot was found during the site walk that was 48' wide on the R.O.W.

Mark Suennen noted that Kevin Leonard had suggested in his review comments that the Board decide if the stumps should be removed in the R.O.W. from the trees that will be cut to achieve the driveway site distances. Mark Suennen believed the stumps would provide stability

8/14/18

#### DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

on the steep slope. Kevin Leonard agreed. The Road Agent noted he had discussed this with the developer and site contractor and they were in agreement to work with him on which stumps would be removed. Mark Suennen asked the Road Agent if he would identify the stumps that he would want removed or the ones that would stay. The Road Agent replied that the stumps to be removed would be identified. The Planning Coordinator suggested that a note be added to the plan for the agreement between the Road Agent and the developer. Mark Suennen said the note could state 'clearing within the R.O.W. and stumps should remain unless identified for removal.' Peter Hogan asked why wouldn't the Board request that the developer removes all the stumps along the R.O.W. to prepare for the widening of the road. Mark Suennen responded that would degrade the stability of the slopes. Peter Hogan opined that the developer should be responsible for this cost. Mark Suennen believed the agreement with the Road Agent and the developer would be to clear and grade 9 feet from the edge of the existing R.O.W. to prepare for the widening of the road in the future. Kevin Leonard thought that the agreement for clearing 9 feet back would only be in the areas for the driveways. Earl Sandford agreed with Kevin Leonard and stated that he would not recommend disturbing any additional area then what would be agreed for the driveways. Mark Suennen noted that the 9 feet of clearing in the areas of the driveways could make it difficult for the Town to plow the road. Earl Sandford noted the homeowner would be responsible for snow removal in the areas cleared for driveways on the roadway. The Town would only plow the existing R.O.W. Kevin Leonard asked if the driveway areas being excavated would be a grubbing exercise or is there expectations for gravel. The Road Agent replied that the areas would only be cleared to sub grade. Rodney Towne noted that the whole point of having the areas cleared for the driveways is to prepare for the future widening of the road, so the Town would not end up being responsible to clear those areas but it was unknown when the project will happen. He continued that it would be the property owners responsibility to clear the driveway areas beyond the existing R.O.W.

27 28 29

30

31

Peter Hogan noted he had concerns with the Town having to move the detention pond proposed along the stonewall when the road is widened. Rodney Towne agreed and stated that the proposed locations for drainage structures should be moved further away from the stonewalls so they do not become an issue for the Town when the road is widened.

323334

35

36

3738

Amy Sanders questioned if the grading for the septic field on Lot 12/52-2 extended into the R.O.W. Earl Sandford explained that the grading in that area was required for the driveway site distance, which ended up matching the grade coming down from the septic system. Amy Sanders asked if a retaining wall would be necessary if the grades do not match up when the road is widened. Earl Sandford said the developer would prepare the area for the required site distance to accommodate the future plan to widen the road.

39 40 41

42

43

44

Ed Carroll asked if the Board had received all the items requested from the developer. Peter Hogan thought there were many items that should be clarified before the Board approved the subdivision. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, explained that the Board would need to request an extension on the deadline of August 30, 2018, if the hearing were adjourned.

8/14/18

#### DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

Earl Sandford believed the Board could approve the subdivision with conditions; the items that need to be clarified are administrative. Peter Hogan asked if Earl Sandford could take another look at the detention pond proposed location having an impact when the road is widened. Mark Suennen believed some kind of design for the road would be needed for Earl Sandford to look at what Peter Hogan had asked. Peter Hogan said that he would be fine with the design if Earl Sandford did not believe it would ever be an issue, but he expressed he had concerns with the detention pond being installed along the stonewall becoming an issue.

Rodney Towne noted that he had walked the property with the Road Agent and Kevin Leonard after the work session. Kevin Leonard had some concerns regarding the drainage structures that he had addressed with Earl Sandford. Rodney Towne asked Kevin Leonard if he had any other concerns with the drainage structures being proposed. Kevin Leonard stated there are a few items that will need to be addressed but nothing he felt that would prevent a conditional approval.

Peter Hogan noted if the Road Agent and the Town Engineer were satisfied with the proposed design and did not believe there would be any issues for the Town when the road is widened in the future, he would be fine with what is being proposed. The Road Agent noted that he believed the design adequately accommodated the road shift and widening. Earl Sandford stated that he would not propose a design with drainage structures if he did not believe it would be adequate. Earl Sandford continued that if a shift in the location of the 2' trench was required during the road improvements that could be done quickly with an excavator. Mark Suennen believed by that time these lots would be privately owned property. Earl Sandford said the Town would need to approach the owners to notify the trench would need to be pushed back and he could add a note on the plan to prevent issues. Mark Fougere suggested the Town request an easement for 5' or 10' along the properties road frontage. Peter Hogan noted that although the Town would be responsible for the cost if the trenches had to be moved during the road construction, the owners would not need to be notified with an easement in place. Earl Sandford agreed that an easement would be beneficial.

Amy Sanders asked Earl Sandford if there was room to push back the detention areas now rather than having them so close to the property lines. Earl Sandford explained that if the structures were pushed back, the further the slope would need to be chased and he designed the plan with the least amount of impact.

Mark Suennen noted that the front property bounds should be true and marked with granite bounds. Earl Sandford noted that the Town required granite markers for front property lines but that would be pointless if the markers are removed during road construction. Mark Fougere opined that granite markers would be more noticeable than a drill hole. Rodney Towne stated that the Town requires granite markers for the front property lines, plus property owners easily identify these for front property lines. Earl Sandford suggested that as an alternative, if a drill

8/14/18

# DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

hole is found in a boulder on the front property line, a witness marker could be used to easily identify the property lines.

Mark Suennen opened the hearing to the public.

Matthew and Kelly Kennerson, of 91 Christie Road, noted that they only had concerns with the existing culvert already having clogging issues. He said the plan clearly shows that the grade was technically sloped in the wrong direction and almost fundamentally level, which would not allow water to flow properly and self clean as it should. Peter Hogan asked the Road Agent if the Town planned on replacing the existing road culverts on Christie Road. The Road Agent replied yes, there would be 3 culverts that he planned to replace. Mark Suennen asked if the culverts would be replaced when the road is widened or sooner. The Road Agent noted that he would rather replace the culverts sooner than later but was unsure when that would be. Matt Kennerson noted that he was fine with the development across the street as long as the Town knew the culverts were an issue and they planned on eventually replacing them.

Peter Hogan asked if there were any other comments from the public. There were none.

David Litwinovich asked if the driveway permits had been approved by the Road Agent. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, said the Road Agent had approved the driveways that were originally submitted but she explained that the updated sketches would need to be submitted for the Road Agent to sign off on the new driveway locations.

Rodney Towne asked if the Board decided if the 10' easement discussed earlier along the frontage would be needed. Peter Hogan believed the easement to the Town would be beneficial. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, noted that could be part of the conditional approval and would need to be approved by Town Counsel. Peter Hogan asked what kind of easement would be needed. The Board decided it would need to be a Slope & Drainage Easement that clearly states the Town would have the right to expand the R.O.W. if and when necessary and note that the Town would not be responsible for the private drainage structures along the front of the properties. The purpose of having the easement would allow the Town rights to go onto the property during the construction to widen the roadway. Earl Sandford thought that the compromise of the easement being requested, would be the Town would be responsible for relocating the private drainage structures along the front property lines at such time, if necessary.

Ed Carroll said he would agree with Peter Hogan and was concerned with the Town being responsible for relocating the drainage structures and asked Earl Sandford if he would be willing to look at moving the location of the detention pond. Earl Sandford explained that would be a domino effect and more of an area would end up being disturbed, which he was trying to avoid because of the steep slopes. He continued to explain that the proposed design facilitated the natural slope of the land to keep the flow of water as it would in its natural state. Earl Sandford stated that he would be opposed to relocating the detention pond at this time because it was

8/14/18

#### DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

a big 'what if', there is no proposed design and relocating the detention pond may not even be necessary when the road is widened.

Peter Hogan asked where the spill way would lead too. Earl Sandford replied that would go into a riprap apron into the road culvert. Peter Hogan asked when he would anticipate that spillway to spill over. Earl Sandford replied rain events over an inch of rainfall but it would be more controlled than it was in its natural state because the detention basin would hold water and slowly release it into the road culvert. Peter Hogan noted that he had concerns with the drainage when the ground was frozen or if there were back-to-back rainstorms. Earl Sandford noted that he would need to verify what storm event calculations were used for the design; it would be either a 25 or 50-year storm event. Peter Hogan asked how long would it take after a rain event for the water level to drop an inch. Earl Sandford replied that generally with the soils found in the area, the water level should drop 3" an hour.

Peter Hogan noted he was concerned that the property owners would not maintain the drainage structures properly. Earl Sandford noted that the Owner's Manual would include instructions for the maintenance of the private drainage structures.

Mark Suennen asked Earl Sandford what would be proposed for the active and substantial improvements. Earl Sandford stated that the driveway cuts would be installed for the active improvements within 2 years and the drainage would be completed within 5 years for the substantial improvements.

Mark Suennen went over the conditions precedent for approval that had been discussed. Item 1 - Submission of the revised plans, including all checklist corrections and any corrections as noted at this hearing and including the Stormwater Management Plans if separate from the subdivision plan; all plan revisions will need to be reviewed by the Town Engineer to verify that all concerns were addressed. Item 2 – Submission of a 10' Slope and Drainage Easement onto Tax Map Lot(s) #12/52-1, 12/52-2 and 12/52-3, to benefit the Town of New Boston and written to satisfy the Town's Attorney. Item 3 – Submission of the simplified Owner's and Maintenance Manual for the drainage structures on each lot.

Amy Sanders asked if there was a way to have the required maintenance stated in the properties deeds, so the owners are aware that they will be responsible for the maintenance of the private drainage structures on the lots they own. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, noted that the ISWMP are required on the plan and will be noted in the deed, but the Board could request that too be added on the plan and in the deeds. Earl Sandford noted that he intended to add a note into the Manuals that warned the property owner's they would be liable for any damages caused by not maintaining the drainage systems. Rodney Towne noted he would prefer it be noted in the deed, and could state something simple, i.e. 'the property contains stormwater management systems, that must be maintained by the property owner.' The Planning

8/14/18

#### DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

Coordinator suggested including a note to reference the Owner's Manual within the required note already on the plan for the Stormwater. The Board and Applicant agreed.

Mark Suennen noted that the condition would be revised for Item 3 – Submission of the simplified Owner's and Maintenance Manual with the notation modified on the deed to incorporate the requirement to maintain the Stormwater Systems on the properties in perpetuity.

The Planning noted that the Board would need a deadline from the applicant to complete the conditions of the approval. Earl Sandford noted the conditions could be completed in 90 days.

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to approve the Major Subdivision Plan of David M. & Danielle Deyo, Tax Map/Lot #12/52, Christie and Roby Roads, in the Town of New Boston, NH, subject to the conditions as follows;

 1. Submission of revised plat, including all checklist corrections and any corrections as noted at this hearing and including the Stormwater Management Plan if separate from the subdivision plan (all revised plans to be reviewed by Town Engineer);

2. Submission of a 10 Foot Slope and Drainage Easement, to benefit the Town of New Boston, on Tax Map/Lot #(s) 12/52-1, 12/52-2, 12/52-3, for review and approval by Town Counsel, the cost of which review shall be borne by the applicant;

3. Submission of a revised Inspection & Maintenance Owner's Manual with a note added to the plan referencing that 'the owner shall be responsible to inspect and maintain the permanent ISWMP structures on their property as outlined in the Inspection & Maintenance Owner's Manual';

4. Submission of a suitable mylar for recording at the HCRD;

5. An 'Individual Stormwater Management Plan' (ISWMP) to be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit, will be required for land disturbance or development in 'Critical Areas' (both those designated on the plan or created during development). For building permits requiring an ISWMP, Certificates of Occupancy will only be issued after receipt of a 'Stormwater Management Plan Compliance Statement' as specified in the New Boston Subdivision Regulations;

6. Deeds for each lot shall have the following statement: 'The property herein described is subject to the following conditions as described in the recorded subdivision plan referenced above: A Stormwater Management Plan will be required prior to the issuance of a building permit if any land is to be disturbed in the designated or created Critical Areas. The owner is responsible to inspect and maintain the permanent ISWMP structures on their property as outlined in the Inspection & Maintenance Owner's Manual';

7. Submission of any outstanding fees related to the subdivision application or recording of documents at the HCRD;

8/14/18

#### DAVID M. & DANIELLE DEYO, cont.

8. Upon completion of the conditions precedent, the final plans and mylar shall be signed by the Board and forwarded for recording at the HCRD.

The deadline date for compliance with the conditions precedent shall be **NOVEMBER 14, 2018**. Rodney Towne seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

# Discussion, re: Impact Fee Ordinance

Peter Hogan asked Mark Fougere where he got the language for the Impact Fee Ordinance draft that he had provided to the Board. Mark Fougere noted that it was a combination of the existing Impact Fees Ordinance in Milford and Pelham. He explained that Milford's had been in effect since 1989 and Pelham's had been adopted for 15-20 years and successfully been through a couple lawsuits. Mark Fougere noted this would be the generic ordinance language that would enable the Board to calculate and charge an Impact Fee, but only if and when a capital project passes at Town Vote. Rodney Towne believed that if money were collected as an Impact Fee, the Town would have 6 years from collection to use those funds.

Ed Carroll asked if an Impact Fee could have been collected from the Deyo subdivision just approved where road improvements would be needed. Mark Fougere said that a road impact fee could have been collected, but that was more along the lines of an exaction fee. He explained that without some type of design or plan for the road improvements, it would be difficult to calculate and collect fees. Ed Carroll asked if Milford, Pelham or any Town in NH have an active road impact fee. Mark Fougere said maybe Hudson and Mark Suennen said Bedford, but not many Town's collected those kinds of fees. Rodney Towne noted that the Board had required bonds for road improvements when needed. Mark Fougere noted that the Statue allows the Board to assess and negotiate road improvement cost for site specific, off site road improvements. Rodney Towne explained that the Impact Fee Ordinance would only be used to collect funds for capital projects, i.e. school addition, water and sewer, etc.

Rodney Towne asked Mark Fougere if fees could start to be collected before the project started. Mark Fougere said that would be risky and he would not recommend it, unless the project is locked in, meaning the voters passed it and the cost were solid. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, noted that the fees would be difficult to track if there were no active projects. Mark Fougere said that if the Impact Fee Ordinance were to pass and the school addition passed, the Board could start looking at collecting fees for new developments. The Planning Coordinator noted that the fees could only be assessed and charged for the cost of the extra space.

Ed Carroll asked if there were any other projects, besides the school and fire projects, that the Town could need in the future. Rodney Towne believed that the Town could be required at the Federal level, to install a sewer and water management system in the Village because there is a true storage issue. Mark Fougere noted that he had deleted water and sewer from the

8/14/18

Discussion, re: Impact Fee Ordinance, cont.

Ordinance draft but he would add it back into the document. Ed Carroll asked Mark Fougere if he had deleted anything else from the document. Mark Fougere replied no.

Rodney Towne noted that he would be in favor of the Impact Fee Ordinance going onto the ballot. David Litwinovich agreed and suggested that the explanation be clearly written to be sure voters know what they are voting for on the ballot.

Mark Fougere suggested that the document be sent for legal review prior to putting it on the ballot for this year. The Board agreed.

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

Ed Carroll – pg 7, under Conservation & Natural Resources the statement was not updated as discussed. Mark Suennen referred to the meeting minutes from May 22, 2018 and read the requested change.

Mark Suennen noted that the Board still had to make a decision on what to do with the housing goal. He opined that it should not be deleted as a goal but understood why Rodney Towne thought it should be. The Board should exercise the goal more often and keep the statement as the housing goal within the Master Plan. The Board decided to keep the goal listed and agreed to practice the goal more often.

David Litwinovich referred to the statement that Ed Carroll had sent to the Board and opined that could be included on the sign off page. The Board reviewed, discussed and decided on the wording for the intro statement that will be added to the adoption sign off page.

David Litwinovich pointed out that Chapter 7 was included in the main body of the Master Plan and duplicated word for word in the appendix. The duplicate of Chapter 7 would be deleted from the appendix.

Mark Suennen believed that the Board was close enough to completion to be able to schedule the Public Hearing to adopt the 2018 Master Plan Update. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, noted that the Board would get the final draft to review at the meeting on September 11, 2018, and the Public Hearing could be scheduled for October 9, 2018, that would give the office enough time to publish the Public Notice.

# Miscellaneous Business and correspondence for the meeting of August 14, 2018, including, but not limited to:

1. Approval of the May 22, 2018, meeting minutes, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

8/14/18

Miscellaneous Business and correspondence, cont.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, noted that the Board would need to approve the requested change that Ed Carroll had emailed. Peter Hogan asked if the minutes were incorrect with what he had said. Ed Carroll said he was unsure what he had said during the meeting but he intended to say what he drafted in the email he sent. Peter Hogan explained that the Board wouldn't be allowed to change what they actually said in the meeting. The Planning Coordinator had the Planning Assistant write down what Ed Carroll had said verbatim and the Board decided on how the minutes would be updated.

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to approve the May 22, 2018, meeting minutes, with changes. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

2. Approval of the June 12, 2018, meeting minutes, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

David Litwinovich **MOVED** to approve the June 12, 2018, meeting minutes, with changes. Rodney Towne seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

3. Distribution of the June 26, 2018, meeting minutes, for approval, at the September 11, 2018, meeting, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

4. Distribution of the July 10, 2018, meeting minutes, for approval, at the September 11, 2018, meeting, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

5. Discussion with Planning Coordinator, re: what constitutes a 'New Road'.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, explained that the Fire Wards have been discussing what would constitute as a 'new road'. She continued that she and Wayne Blassberg had discussed what the Zoning Ordinance had for the definition of a 'New Street' and she had provided the Fire Wards with what she believed would be considered as a 'new road'. She wanted to confirm with the Board what she had provided to the Fire Wards, because they would use the term 'new road' in the cistern document they are preparing for the discussion with the Planning Board that is scheduled for September 25, 2018.

The Board agreed with what the Planning Coordinator had provided to the Fire Wards. The Planning Coordinator noted that this definition would only be used for the Fire Fighting Water Supply discussion with the Fire Wards.

6. Discussion with Planning Coordinator, re: Planning Board member appointment to CIP Committee.

8/14/18

Miscellaneous Business and correspondence, cont.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, stated that David Litwinovich had been the Planning Board member sitting on the CIP Committee and hoped that he would like to continue as the Representative. David Litwinovich noted that he would like to continue to serve as the Planning Board member for CIP.

7. Draft of Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Handbook, for the Board's information.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver, asked Ed Carroll if he had any updates to report. Ed Carroll replied no.

8a. Memorandum, dated August 1, 2018, to Planning Board Chairman, Peter Hogan, re: Start-up of 2019-2024 Capital Improvements Plan Process, for the Board's information.

8b. Memorandum, dated August 3, 2018, to Planning Board Chairman, Peter Hogan, re: CIP Info & Schedule, for the Board's information.

9a. Memorandum copy, dated July 12, 2018, from Stephen G. Pernaw, P.E., PTOE, Stephen G. Pernaw & Company, Inc., re: response to SNHPC review comments, Whitetail Commercial Development, Weare, NH, for the Board's information.

9b. Email copy, received July 18, 2018, from Nate Miller, SNHPC, re: Memorandum from Stephen G. Pernaw, P.E., PTOE, Whitetail Commercial Development, Weare, NH, Traffic Impact Assessments, for the Board's information.

9c. Copy of AoT Permit for Whitetail Commercial Development, Weare, NH, for the Board's information.

9d. Whitetail Commercial Development, Weare, NH, full size plan set, received July 23, 2018, marked as FINAL, dated July 18, 2018.

Mark Suennen noted that he had attended the Weare Planning Board meeting and the FI-NAL plans submitted had been extensively reviewed at the July meeting and the hearing was adjourned for the Board to review and consider the requested conditions the public had presented.

10a. Copy of Notice of Decision, for a Special Exception to operate a kennel, granted on July 18, 2018, for Kristin Morrissey and Cameron Jordan, 449 Joe English Road, Tax Map/Lot #14/61, for the Board's information.

10b. Letter Request, received August 13, 2018, from Kristin Morrissey and Cameron Jordan, to waive major NRSPR requirements, for a kennel application, for the Board's action.

8/14/18

Miscellaneous Business and correspondence, cont.

 The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver explained the waiver request was submitted because the regulations require that the applicant submit as a Major Site Plan if the Zoning Board grants the 'Special Exception'. She explained that the Board had waived this requirement for a few other kennels but those applicants ended up submitting professionally prepared plans. The Planning Coordinator suggested that the Board review the regulations and consider updating the Major requirement of a professional site plan if a Special Exception is granted but some applications will still require a professional site plan, i.e. gravel pits or commercial type kennels. David Litwinovich asked if the Board should discuss updating these on the ballot this year. The Planning Coordinator replied yes.

Peter Hogan noted that he preferred seeing what the applicants are planning before granting the waiver. Mark Suennen said the applicants could come in for an informational type session. The Board agreed.

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to adjourn the meeting at 9:09 p.m. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

Respectfully submitted, Nadine Scholes, Planning Board Assistant Minutes Approved: 10/09/18