Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

1 2

The virtual meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Planning Board Chairman Peter Hogan. Present virtually at the opening of the meeting were Planning Board Vice Chairman Mark Suennen, Ex-Officio David Litwinovich, and regular Board members Ed Carroll and Amy Sanders.

Also present virtually 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 virtual meeting were Bob Kilmer, Steven Caggiano, Jacqueline Filiault, Hailey Nase, Thomas Carr, Michael Halvatzes and Cahli Carothers

Peter Hogan read the meeting preamble as follows,

'MEETING PREAMBLE DURING COVID-19 EMERGENCY

 Good evening, as the Chairman of the Town of New Boston Planning Board, I am invoking the provisions of RSA 91-A:2, III (b) during the current State of Emergency. Governor Sununu has issued Emergency Order #12, pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, that allows local government and this public body to meet virtually. I am declaring that conducting this meeting is imperative and required in order to continue vital Town government, services and operations.

We have utilized the Zoom platform to conduct the meeting and all Board members will have the ability to communicate concurrently and the public has access to concurrently listen and if necessary, will be given the opportunity to participate in the meeting when opened for public comment.

If anyone has an issue connecting, they should contact Nadine Scholes

 Property owners, applicant and direct abutters were given proper notice of this hearing, along with the instructions of how to access the meeting. Public Notice and Zoom access instructions were also posted for public view on Town website.

To help minimize background noise and provide privacy to everyone, we have started this meeting with all microphones muted and video cameras off. You do not need to turn on your camera to participate in the meeting and we ask that everyone keep their microphones muted unless you would like to speak. Any public comment will need to wait until the meeting is opened to the public and will need full name and address stated for the record.

If anyone accessing this meeting is disruptive, they will be asked to cease the disruptive behavior. Should the disruption continue thereafter, that person will be automatically removed from the meeting.

 Please be aware all votes taken during this meeting will be done by Roll Call vote. Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their name, please also state if there is anyone else in the room with you during this meeting, under the provisions of the Right-to-know law.'

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

Roll Call attendance, Peter Hogan present and alone, Mark Suennen present and alone, Amy Sanders present and alone, Ed Carroll present and alone, David Litwinovich present and alone, Mark Fougere, Planning Consultant, present and alone, Shannon Silver, Planning Coordinator, present and alone and Nadine Scholes, Planning Assistant, present and alone.

- CAGGIANO, EUGENE S. & HELEN B. (OWNER)
- 8 CAGGIANO, STEVEN W. & ANGELA (OWNER)
 - SANDFORD SURVEYING & ENGINEERING, INC (APPLICANT)
- 10 Submission of Application/Public Hearing/Lot Line Adjustment/Minor/2 Lots
- 11 Location: Bunker Hill Road
- 12 Tax Map/Lot #(s) 1/11 & 1/25
- 13 Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District

Bob Kilmer presented the proposed Lot Line Adjustment plan of Tax Map/Lot #1/11 & 1/25. He noted that Tax Map/Lot #1/25, 176 Bunker Hill Road, consist of approximately 76 acres with most of the land currently protected with a conservation easement, known as the 'Great Meadow'. The lot contains a single family home with septic within the 8 acre conservation easement exclusion area and the lot is accessed through Tax Map/Lot #1/27, with the existing driveway easement. The second lot, Tax Map/Lot #1/11, currently consist of 19.17 acres with a single family home, septic, barn and riding arena. The Lot Line Adjustment would create a new lot line on Tax Map/Lot #1/25, reducing the size of that lot to 40.10 acres and the 35.221 acres would become part of Tax Map/Lot #1/11, making that lot a total of 54.395 acres.

Bob Kilmer said that Hailey Nase from the Piscataquog Land Conservancy, received the proposed plans on January 25, 2021. Mark Suennen noted that Hailey Nase had joined the ZOOM meeting. Mark Fougere mentioned that Hailey Nase had submitted a letter in response to the application.

Bob Kilmer explained that the owners are experiencing some personal hardships and requested if possible, that the Board provide a conditional approval. He noted there are two (2) waivers requested, for topo and studies because both lots are developed with existing homes, no new lots are proposed, and the bulk of the land is under Conservation Easement protection.

Mark Suennen clarified the Lot Line Adjustment proposed would take 35.221 acres from Tax Map/Lot #1/25, and combine with Tax Map/Lot #1/11, currently consisting of 19.174 acres, with the 35.221 acres added, making that lot a total of 54.395 acres. The Conservation Easement would now cross over the boundary of both properties. Bob Kilmer replied yes, the area under the Conservation Easement would not change but now would need to be added/included on the deed for Tax Map/Lot #1/11.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver noted that the correspondence received from Hailey Nase, Piscataquog Land Conservancy, requested that the Conservation Easement language be included in the deeds for both lots, Tax Map/Lot #1/11 & 1/25.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

CAGGIANO, EUGENE S. & HELEN B., cont.

The Board discussed the need to conduct a site walk. David Litwinovich said he would drive by and if there were any concerns, he would report back to the Planning Department. The Board agreed with David Litwinovich driving by in lieu of conducting a site walk and that could be part of the conditional approval.

Peter Hogan opened for public comment.

Hailey Nase, Piscataquog Land Conservancy, noted that the letter she had submitted states that the PLC had no objections to the Lot Line Adjustment proposed, but would ask that a copy of the surveyed plans be sent to them to assure that the monuments are properly marked so they can easily monitor the Conservation Easement with the additional land owner.

Mark Suennen noted that the only new monument would be the new front lot line for Tax Map/Lot #1/11, on Bunker Hill Road. Bob Kilmer agreed and explained that the front lot line marker is identified with an iron pin. Mark Suennen stated that front markers would be required to be a granite bound as oppose to a pin. Bob Kilmer explained that in order to install a granite bound the frontage would need to be torn down and would request that the marker remain as the iron pin. Mark Suennen noted a waiver request would be required in order for the Board to accept the front boundary to be identified with an iron pin. Bob Kilmer asked if the waiver request for the front boundary marker could be added now. Peter Hogan said yes but the written request would need to be submitted to the Planning Department.

Mark Suennen asked Hailey Nase if the PLC would be able to accept the front lot marker as proposed. Hailey Nase requested that the lot line be clearly marked to monitor the Conservation Easement properly for both lots. Bob Kilmer said a marker could be placed on the edge of the wetland. Hailey Nase said that a marker would be helpful to monitor the 2 separate lots.

There were no other public comments.

The Board agreed there were no outstanding items besides the submittal for the additional waiver request.

 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to accept the application as complete. Ed Carroll seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion **PASSED**. 5-0, Roll Call Vote: Peter Hogan-yes, David Litwinovich-yes, Ed Carroll-yes, Amy Sanders-yes, Mark Suennen-yes.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

CAGGIANO, EUGENE S. & HELEN B., cont.

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to grant the waiver for Traffic, Fiscal and Environmental Studies. Ed Carroll seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion **PASSED**. 5-0, Roll Call Vote: Peter Hogan-yes, David Litwinovich-yes, Ed Carroll-yes, Amy Sanders-yes, Mark Suennen-yes.

Mark Suennen asked if the Conservation Easement boundaries had been surveyed. Bob Kilmer replied that the recorded plan by Harry Murray, done back around 1988, was overlayed to identify the Conservation Easement boundaries. Mark Suennen asked Bob Kilmer to share the Conservation Easement details with the PLC. Bob Kilmer stated that updated plans would be provided to the PLC. The deed language for the Conservation Easement would be taken off of the existing Conservation Easement deed and reference the plan that shows the Conservation Easement area.

 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to grant the waiver for topography, water courses, area breakdowns for districts. Amy Sanders seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion **PASSED**. 5-0, Roll Call Vote: Peter Hogan-yes, David Litwinovich-yes, Ed Carroll-yes, Amy Sanders-yes, Mark Suennen-yes.

Mark Suennen noted that a written request for the front boundary marker would need to be submitted and would be included as part of the conditions for approval.

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to grant the waiver for the front boundary marker to be accepted as a pin placed in the stonewall based on maintaining the stonewall along the frontage of Bunker Hill Road. David Litwinovich seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion **PASSED**. 5-0, Roll Call Vote: Peter Hoganyes, David Litwinovich-yes, Ed Carroll-yes, Amy Sanders-yes, Mark Suennen-yes.

Mark Suennen explained that in addition to the standard conditions for approval, a condition would be added for the site drive by to be completed by a Planning Board member on or before Saturday, February 13, 2021, and provide feedback to the Planning Department, and Sandford would need to provide PLC with the items they have requested.

Mark Suennen reviewed the precedent conditions and asked Bob Kilmer how long would be needed to complete these items. Bob Kilmer requested 30 days. Mark Suennen stated that the deadline would be March 9, 2021.

There were no other items outstanding.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

CAGGIANO, EUGENE S. & HELEN B., cont.

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to approve the Minor Subdivision Plan/Lot Line Adjustment, for Eugene S., Helen B., Steven W. and Angela Caggiano, Tax Map/Lot #1/11 & 1/25, Bunker Hill Road, subject to:

CONDITIONS PRECEDENT:

 1. Submission of a minimum of four (4) blue/blackline copies of the revised plat, including all checklist corrections and any corrections as noted at this hearing;

11 2. Su 12 3. Pa

Submission of the mylar for recording at the HCRD;
Payment of any outstanding fees related to the subdivision application and/or the record-

 ing of documents with the HCRD (if necessary);4. 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 **MARCH 9, 2021**, confirmation of which shall be an administrative act, not requiring further action by the Board. Should compliance not be confirmed by the deadline date and a written request for extension is not submitted by that date, the applicant is hereby put on notice that that the Planning Board <u>may</u> convene a hearing under RSA 676:4-a to revoke the approval. The applicants are further put on notice that this subdivision approval constitutes recogni-

The applicants are further put on notice that this subdivision approval constitutes recognition that the lot configurations are in conformance with local land use regulations. To complete the subdivision, deeds must be transferred.

Ed Carroll seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion **PASSED**. 5-0, Roll Call Vote: Peter Hogan-yes, David Litwinovich-yes, Ed Carroll-yes, Amy Sanders-yes, Mark Suennen-yes.

Informational Session, with Thomas Carr, Meridian Land Services, Inc., re: Subdivision Concept, for Tax Map/Lot #10/70-1, Lyndeborough Road.

Thomas Carr presented the conceptual subdivision plan of Tax Map/Lot #10/70-1, for Michael Halvatzes. He noted that the entire lot has been surveyed with the wetlands delineated and topography. The lot is adjacent to the South Branch of Pistcataquog River and would be part of the Shoreland Protection Act and the setbacks shown for 50', 100' and 250' to identify protection zones.

Thomas Carr noted the proposal showed 3 front lots, with 2+ acres required for each front lot with the 200' square building envelope at the 50' setback and the remainder of 44 acres as the 4th lot. He noted that test pit data for each lot would be presented with the final subdivision application.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

Informational Session, with Thomas Carr, cont.

Thomas Carr explained that the proposed access way from Tax Map/Lot #10/70-1, to Tax Map/Lot #10/70-3 and #10/70-4, is proposed as shown to avoid disturbance to the wetland and buffers for Meadow Brook coming through from across the road along the lots frontage, which has a pending Wetland Permit to replace the existing culvert and could require an easement for the construction and maintenance for that culvert, which would be determined if needed with permitting from the State.

 Thomas Carr noted that the subdivision would be considered a major subdivision application creating 4 new lots from the parent lot, Tax Map/Lot #10/70, and Michael Halvatzes had discussed the need for Fire Fighting Water Supply with the Fire Chief. Michael Halvatzes noted that the Fire Chief had explained that although there are no cisterns in this area, he did explain that sprinklers could be accepted in lieu of installing a cistern.

Peter Hogan asked if there were no access easement, how would Tax Map/Lot #10/70-3 and #10/70-4, be accessed and what would be required for access. Thomas Carr replied that if the lots were accessed from the frontage along Lyndeborough Road there would need to be crossing's installed and impacts to the wetlands and buffers. He said that current DES guidelines prefer an access easement to avoid disturbing the wetland. Peter Hogan stated that if a lot could not be accessed from that lots frontage, it could not be considered as a lot. Thomas Carr explained that the lots would have the 200' required for legal frontage but access would be through an easement. Mark Suennen noted that the Board has a policy that any new lot created would need to prove that lot could obtain a driveway off the lots actual frontage before the Board would consider that to be a legal lot and it be accessed through other lots. Thomas Carr noted that they could go through the motions for State permitting to access the lots but that would not be an easy process and plans would need to be created showing the access from the lots frontage in order to prove the State would permit the access.

Peter Hogan opined that an easement through Tax Map/Lot #10/70-1, across #10/70-3 to access #10/70-4, would be over the maximum allowed length of 100' for common/shared driveways.

Mark Suennen agreed with Peter Hogan on the access for Tax Map/Lot #10/70-4, as shown, did not make sense passing through 2 other lots.

Amy Sanders noted that she preferred not disturbing a wetland whenever possible but understood the Board's concerns with the length allowed for common driveways and passing through other lots.

David Litwinovich agreed that the access as shown would be difficult for the Planning Board to approve.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

Informational Session, with Thomas Carr, cont.

Mark Suennen questioned what the target of the conceptual 4 lot subdivision was. Thomas Carr explained that the owner would keep Tax Map/Lot #10/70-1, to build on and planned to develop the 3 front lots for profit/cash flow.

Mark Suennen stated that there could be some alternate configurations to achieve the 4 lot subdivision. Thomas Carr noted that he and the property owner would need to review and reconsider options for the subdivision layout to achieve a concept that could be proposed. He felt the access easement concept could be questioned by the Board, but he decided to present this concept to get feedback on what would be accepted by the Board.

Michael Halvatzes asked if an access easement through only one lot versus two lots would be more acceptable. The Board provided suggestions to Michael Halvatzes to consider for an acceptable subdivision.

Thomas Carr and Michael Halvatzes thanked the Board for their time and recommendations.

Discussion, re: Updates to Non-Residential Site Plan Review Regulations.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver noted that the Board had discussed going into updating the NRSPR Regulations immediately after completing the Subdivision Regulations update but COVID had postponed the task. She opined that the NRSPR Regulations should not need a complete revision as the Subdivision Regulations had but would still like to the Board to go through them for improvements.

Peter Hogan noted that he felt the Board had no jurisdiction over someone not abiding by an approved Site Plan. The Planning Coordinator noted that the Building and Code Enforcement Officer would be responsible for enforcement of the approved site plans. Peter Hogan opined that enforcement had not happened since Dennis Sarette held the Building and Code Enforcement role. The Planning Coordinator said that concern would need to be taken to the Board of Selectmen to have them discuss with the current Building and Code Official that enforcement is part of his job role and that he has to enforce site plans that are found to be in violation of the approval.

The Board discussed that approved site plans with repeating violations could be revoked by the Board. Peter Hogan believed the Town must find a legal pathway to enforce regulations. Mark Fougere noted that there are State Statue's identifying the appropriate process to institute fines/penalties for violations that the Board could review.

David Litwinovich shared the same concerns with code enforcement, the task was frustrating on figuring out how the Town could propose fines for any violations, and he explained that the other difficult issue is collection of the fines if implemented.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

Discussion, re: Updates to Non-Residential Site Plan Review Regulations, cont.

David Litwinovich asked if the Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver felt the NRSPR Regulations were more user friendly than the Subdivision Regulations were before the update. The Planning Coordinator said the NRSPR Regulations are more user friendly and easier to understand. She thought the Board could review for improvements but did not require the extensive revision as the Subdivision Regulations had needed.

The Board would review the current NRSPR Regulations and continue the discussion at the March 23, 2021, meeting.

Discussion, re: Amendments to New Boston Road Construction Inspection Procedures.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver noted that the drafted minutes were provided to the Board from the January 9, 2021, meeting for the discussion with the Road Agent and Town Engineer. She requested that the Board identified where in the procedure document should the suggested changes be inserted.

David Litwinovich questioned if the Road Construction Inspection Procedures should include more guidance for the Road Agent and Town Engineer when inspecting a new road for the final release of the 2-year Maintenance Bond.

Amy Sanders questioned if the Town's Road Construction Standards should be revised if new roads are meeting the standards with flaws. She explained that slight cracking on new roads was normal in this area because of the climate and that shouldn't always mean the road was constructed incorrectly. The Town specifies the required thickness of each material needed for each layer, that may need to be reviewed by the Town Engineer if new roads are not meeting the Board's expectations for new road construction. Peter Hogan believed that if a new road has cracks within the 2 years, there is an underlying issue/compromise occurring. Mark Suennen replied that road cracks occur for different reasons and it would depend on the nature and location of the crack.

Mark Suennen said he was unsure if there are standards for shoulders/edge of roads but he thought that the Town Engineer should be asked if the current New Boston Road Construction Inspection Procedure included adequate language to address standards for roadway edge of pavement/safety edge.

Amy Sanders asked how often the Town Engineer is onsite when a new road is being constructed. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver noted that the road construction for Forest View, Phase II and III were currently underway and Northpoint had been reporting on the progress weekly. The Town Engineer may not be onsite full time, but they are consistent with reporting on the progress.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

Discussion, re: Amendments to New Boston Road Construction Inspection Procedures, cont.

Peter Hogan noted that often as-builts with field changes are submitted, which concerned him when plans are changed after approval and as-builts are then submitted after the fact. Amy Sanders noted that as-built plans are not always different from what had been approved, mostly as-builts are provided to prove that the construction was completed as approved. Peter Hogan noted that many as-builts submitted to the Board in the past, for whatever reason, had changes from the plans that had been originally approved.

David Litwinovich noted that on page 10-11 of the current Road Construction Inspection Procedure, specifically in regards to the Town Engineer inspections are already aggressive, he read the following from the current document, 'the Town's Consulting Engineer shall inspect pavement placement on a full-time basis', and he questioned if both the contractor and Town Engineer are following this procedure with the concerns that Peter Hogan had in regards to cracking on new roads.

Peter Hogan said there are contractors known to not follow the Road Construction Inspection Procedures, he would like the Town Engineer and the Road Agent to know that they have Planning Board support any time they feel a project should be shut down for not complying to the Town's standards, regulations and/or an approved plan.

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver explained that the Board would need to decide where to insert the drafted language into the Road Construction Inspection Procedures. She said that a new section could be added specific to inspections. Mark Suennen suggested adding the section to page 12, as to how the Town's Consulting Engineer and Road Agent would complete the final inspection on a new road before the Board considered releasing the 2-year maintenance bond.

Mark Fougere recommended that the Town Engineer be asked how long the binder course should be allowed to sit before the 'wearing course' is placed. David Litwinovich said that he hadn't found a specified time frame on how long the binder should sit before the final coat is placed. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver said that may not be included in the Road Construction Inspection Procedure but believed it was included in the Subdivision Regulations. David Litwinovich asked if that should be added to the Road Construction Inspection Procedure. The Planning Coordinator noted that many contractors had requested additional time to put down the wearing coarse because the active construction and trucks travelling on the road could cause damage to the final coat of pavement. The Planning Coordinator said maybe the Town Engineer could provide some insight regarding how long a binder course can survive before damage occurs if there is still active construction and trucking along that road.

The Board agreed to provide what section should include the updates regarding inspections at the next Planning Board meeting.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

Discussion, re: Water Resources Management Plan.

Mark Fougere noted that he believed the Planning Board had specific districts to deal with water resource management, i.e. Wetlands Conservation, Stream Corridor, Groundwater, Steep Slopes District. Given the fact that the Planning Board adopted these districts into Zoning, provide adequate protection and the Water Resources Management Plan would not provide any additional protection beyond what was already adopted and in place. He does not believe that an update to this document would be necessary or useful.

Amy Sanders asked if the Planning Board was allowed to request easements from property owners if there is a subdivision proposed along rivers for protection for future recreational trails or public use and also asked if the Conservation Commission is aware when a subdivision is proposed near a river. The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver replied that the New Boston Conservation Commission is provided a copy of any subdivision plan submitted, whether there are nearby wetlands or not and they could provide feedback if there is a need. She continued that any application submitted is searched and found within the designated river corridor, then an additional notice is sent to Richard Ludders, Chairman of the Piscataquog River Local Advisory Committee for feedback.

The Board agreed that the Water Resources Management Plan would not require revision/updates because the Zoning Ordinance included districts for protection of water resources.

Miscellaneous Business and correspondence for the meeting of February 9, 2021, including, but not limited to:

1. Distribution of the January 12, 2021, meeting minutes, for approval at the March 23, 2021, meeting, with or without changes. (to be distributed by email)

2. Approval of the December 8, 2020, meeting minutes, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to approve the December 8, 2020, meeting minutes, as written. David Litwinovich seconded the motion. Motion **PASSED**. 5-0, Roll Call Vote: Peter Hogan-yes, Mark Suennen-yes, Ed Carroll-yes, David Litwinovich-yes, Amy Sanders-yes.

3. Endorsement of a Non-Residential Site Plan for a kennel, for Travis & Amy Koeppel, d/b/a 'Storybook Labradoodles', Tax Map/Lot #9/41-1, 222 Bog Brook Road, by the Planning Board Chairman and Secretary.

4. Endorsement of a Site Review Agreement for a kennel, for Travis & Amy Koeppel, d/b/a 'Storybook Labradoodles', Tax Map/Lot #9/41-1, 222 Bog Brook Road, by the Planning Board Chairman.

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

Miscellaneous Business and correspondence, cont.

5. Stormwater Adherence Statement and ISWMP Plan, received February 4, 2021, from Earl Sandford, LLS, Sandford Surveying & Engineering, Inc., re: Partial Bond Release for ISWMP, for Tax Map/Lot #12/89-16, Indian Falls Road, for the Board's action.

 The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver noted that the request submitted would be for a reduction based on the percentage of items completed at this time. She felt the reduction amount requested was excessive for the amount of work that still needed to be completed, including some drainage that is not 100% complete. Although the statement/worksheet submitted indicated that the site is stabilized, she felt the Board should determine if the amount requested should be released. The worksheet identified that some items are only 50% complete that she felt would need to be 100% in order to be considered as stabilized.

Mark Suennen noted that the site could not be stabilized at this time because the ground is frozen, but come spring that could change. He felt the entire ISWMP amount should be held until spring in order to determine if the bond could be reduced. Mark Suennen questioned if holding the ISWMP bond would hold up any other permits. The Planning Coordinator said no, they have already been issued the Certificate of Occupancy from the Building Department, the bond could be held until the Board agreed the work is complete and the site is stabilized.

The Board agreed to hold the bond amount in full until the ground thaws in the Spring.

6. 2020 Town of New Boston Report by Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission, received by email January 26, 2021, for the Board's information.

7. Email received February 1, 2021, from Noah Hodgetts, NH OSI, to Planning Assistant, Nadine Scholes, re: Registration for OSI Plan Webinar Series - Digging into RSA 155-E, for the Board's information. (forwarded email to Planning Board prior to meeting)

8. Invoice received February 1, 2021, for services rendered from January 1, 2021 to January 31, 2021, from ConTest Consultants, Inc., for Forest View II, Phase II & III, Field Tests and Analysis, for the Board's information.

9. Letter received February 8, 2021, from Hailey Nase, Stewardship Coordinator, Piscataquog Land Conservancy, to the Planning Board Chairman, Peter Hogan, re: PLC Conservation Easement, Tax Map/Lot #1/11 & #1/25, for the Board's consideration.

Item reviewed during the Subdivision Application hearing for Caggiano.

10. Application for Appointment, received February 8, 2021, from Christin (Cahli) Carothers, for the Board's review and discussion. (Cahli Carothers to be present)

Minutes of 2021 - Meeting conducted virtually, using ZOOM due to COVID-19 pandemic.

2/9/2021

Miscellaneous Business and correspondence, cont.

1 2 3

4

5

6

Mark Suennen asked Cahli Carothers some questions regarding her background. She noted that she held a law degree in Vermont, spent several years in Boston on active duty service for the Coast Guard, search and rescue in Virginia and now resides in New Boston. Mark Suennen asked what kind of law. Cahli Carothers replied Environmental Law but she would be willing to review anything regarding Land Law for the Board if that were needed.

7 8 9

10

11 12

Mark Suennen MOVED to recommend Cahli Carothers be accepted as a Planning Board Alternate member to the Board of Selectmen. Ed Carroll seconded the motion. Motion **PASSED**. 5-0, Roll Call Vote: Peter Hogan-yes, Mark Suennen-yes, Ed Carroll-yes, David Litwinovich-yes, Amy Sanders-yes.

13 14 15

11. Invoice received February 9, 2021, and Construction Reports, for services rendered from December 28, 2020 to January 31, 2021, from Northpoint Engineering, LLC, for Forest View II, Phase II & III, Ongoing Construction Monitoring, for the Board's information.

17 18 19

20

21

22

16

The Planning Coordinator, Shannon Silver noted that Mark Suennen had questioned the data included in the SNHPC Housing Report of 2020, for New Boston, showing 1 new Manufacturing House and 2 new multi-family units added in New Boston had been an error in the report provided by the Census Bureau. Mark Suennen thanked the Planning Coordinator for that feedback.

23 24 25

26

27

Mark Suennen noted that the Board of Selectmen had postponed Town Vote to June 2021, but he preferred to keep the Planning Board scheduled for next meeting to be held on the 4th Tuesday in March 2021, and continue on with once a month meetings for the next few months.

28 29 30

31

32

33

Peter Hogan expressed that the Planning Board should try to resume meeting in person soon. The Board agreed but noted that would need to be discussed further and the guidelines that are in place by the Governor would need to be followed and that may require the Board meet in another location based on the space needed in order to adequately social distance all Board members and public attendees.

34 35 36

There were no other items to be discussed.

37 38

39

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to adjourn the meeting at 8:39 p.m. Amy Sanders seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

40 41

> 42 Respectfully submitted,

43

Nadine Scholes, Planning Board Assistant

Minutes Approved: 4/27/21