

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2013 Meetings

June 11, 2013

1 The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Planning Board Chairman Stu Lewin.
2 Present were regular members Don Duhaime and Mark Suennen, alternate member David
3 Litwinovich and Ex-Officio Christine Quirk. Also present were Planning Coordinator Nic
4 Strong, Planning Board Assistant Shannon Silver and Recording Clerk Valerie Diaz.

5
6 Present in the audience for part of the meeting was Scott Whitney.

7
8 The Chairman sat David Litwinovich as a full-voting member in Peter Hogan's absence.

9
10 **Review of Planning Board Goals for 2013**

11
12 There were no audience members present.

13 The Chairman asked the Coordinator to go over the memorandum, dated June 5, 2013,
14 re: Goals of 2013.

15 The Coordinator pointed out that the first goal to discuss was relative to cul-de-sacs and
16 would be discussed later in the meeting.

17 The Coordinator noted that the second goal was "List of roads for Master Plan". She
18 indicated that she was in the process of setting up a daytime meeting with the Road Agent, Road
19 Committee, and Planning Department to determine the status of the road mapping project. The
20 Chairman asked that he be advised of the date and time of the meeting as he was interested in
21 attending.

22 The Coordinator explained that the third goal was relative to "Other Zoning Districts".
23 i.e., considering other potential zoning districts or changes based on the current Master Plan.

24 The Coordinator advised that the fourth goal was updating the Master Plan. She noted
25 that Charlie French and Dan Reidy from the UNH Cooperative Extension would be present at the
26 next meeting to discuss the Master Plan visioning process. She indicated that Charlie French and
27 Dan Reidy had facilitated the 2004 Community Profile that had been very successful. She
28 explained that they had a standard procedure that rolled along very well. She noted that the fee
29 charged for gathering input to update the Master Plan was \$1,500.00. She stated that there was
30 also an option of contacting outside consultants and as such she had contacted Steve Whitman at
31 Jeff Taylor and Associates. She indicated that the charge for gathering input for the Master Plan
32 was roughly \$2,000.00. She continued that Steve Whitman would also be available to help with
33 chapter re-writes and/or updates at an hourly rate. The Chairman asked for Steve Whitman to be
34 scheduled to meet with the Planning Board during the July 23, 2013, meeting.

35 The Coordinator stated that the fifth goal, "Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision and NRSR
36 Regulations", would be discussed later in the meeting as it was on the agenda for 7:15 p.m.

37 The Coordinator explained that in addition to the 2013 Goals there were also pending
38 goals/ongoing goals not currently being worked on. She noted that the Board had determined to
39 postpone any further action with regard to the Mixed Use/Village District at this time, pending
40 new information or Master Plan work that would indicate the need to keep working on it.

41 The Coordinator advised that the Workforce/Multi-Family Housing bill HB215 was
42 deemed inexpedient to legislate. The Chairman asked for an explanation of the term
43 "inexpedient to legislate". The Coordinator explained that "inexpedient to legislate" killed the

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2013 Meetings**

June 11, 2013

1 **PLANNING BOARD GOALS 2013, cont.**

2
3 bill because it was too complicated to work on or because they no longer wanted to work on it.

4 The Coordinator stated that each Board member had received a copy of the Water
5 Resources Management Plan to review, however, a deadline to complete the review and discuss
6 the plan had not been set. The Chairman suggested that the deadline for discussion be at the
7 August 27, 2013, meeting.

8 The Chairman suggested that Zoning District discussion be scheduled for September 10,
9 2013.

10 The Chairman asked for comments and/or questions. David Litwinovich indicated that
11 he had read the Future Land Use chapter of the Master Plan and asked if the maps had been
12 updated since 2004. The Coordinator answered no. David Litwinovich commented that public
13 opinion with regard to a Mixed Use/Village District had not changed much since 2004.

14
15 **Continued discussion, re: Zoning Ordinance/Subdivision/Non-Residential Site Plan Review**
16 **Regulations questions.**

17
18 The Chairman stated that the Board had sent a letter to the Conservation Commission that
19 asked if there were areas in Town that were more conducive to open space subdivisions. He
20 advised that a response had been received and it appeared that the Conservation Commission was
21 looking to do more than what the Board had been thinking. He went on to say that the
22 Conservation Commission had suggested that a sub-committee be formed to work with the
23 Board.

24 The Chairman recommended that the Board set expectations for the Conservation
25 Commission so that they were not completing more work than was necessary. Don Duhaime
26 asked for the Conservation Commission's role. He believed that the Conservation Commission
27 had gotten out of hand during the Twin Bridge Subdivision. He continued that Wright Drive had
28 been turned into something that was inappropriate. The Chairman stated that the Conservation
29 Commission was an advisory committee. Don Duhaime commented that the Conservation
30 Commission had gone four steps beyond their advisory capacity during Phase II of the Twin
31 Bridge Subdivision. He went on to say that it seemed that the Conservation Commission took
32 land and did not do anything the swampland. It was Don Duhaime's opinion that the swampland
33 should be left for the abutters to pay taxes on. He reiterated that the Conservation Commission
34 had overstepped their bounds with regard to the Twin Bridge Subdivision.

35 The Chairman wanted to take Don Duhaime's comments and apply them to the task of
36 setting expectations for the Conservation Commission with regard to the open space inquiry.
37 Mark Suennen agreed with Don Duhaime that the Conservation Commission had completed
38 extensive work relative to the Twin Bridge Subdivision before the Board had seen the proposal
39 from the applicant. He went on to say that it had appeared that the decision that the road should
40 be a cul-de-sac and not a through road was made for the Board. He noted that there had been
41 strong community support for the cul-de-sac which pushed the Board in a particular direction.
42 Don Duhaime agreed with Mark Suennen.

43 Mark Suennen believed that the Board needed to make sure that the Conservation

June 11, 2013

1 **ZONING/SUBDIVISION/SPR QUESTIONS, cont.**

2
3 Commission understood what the Board was asking of them before they began any work on the
4 open space inquiry. He stated that it needed to be made very clear that the Board was not about
5 to require that every subdivision have open space. He continued that the Board was asking the
6 Conservation Commission to create a list of priorities of types of land or areas of Town that were
7 appropriate for open space development. Christine Quirk commented that Mark Suennen's
8 remarks were very good.

9 David Litwinovich stated that he was fairly happy with the open space regulations as they
10 were written. He believed that if the last three open space subdivisions were presented to the
11 Board today, the Board would be more aggressive in pushing back.

12 The Chairman indicated that the first question asked of the Conservation Commissions
13 was, "Does the Conservation Commission think that there are areas of Town that are more
14 conducive to open space subdivisions than others?" He noted that the second question asked
15 was, "The Board was wondering if the Conservation Commission thinks there are any better
16 incentives that could be provided that would encourage more open space development." Mark
17 Suennen asked how the Conservation Commission had responded to the previously stated
18 questions. The Chairman answered that the Conservation Commission had expressed that they
19 would like to be more involved and suggested that a copy of the Board's memo be sent to Ken
20 Lombard, Open Space Committee. He continued that the Conservation Commission was
21 thinking about forming a small sub-committee to work with the Board on this issue.

22 The Chairman stated that he wanted to give some course correction to the Conservation
23 Commission as it sounded like they were making this matter a much bigger deal than it needed to
24 be. He asked the Board for suggestions on how to respond to the Conservation Commission's
25 response. David Litwinovich suggested that Mark Suennen's previous comments be sent as a
26 response. Mark Suennen believed that the Conservation Commission could do whatever they
27 wanted but he thought the Conservation Commission should know that the expectation of the
28 Board was not to accept wholesale changes and protect every natural resource that was pointed
29 out. He added that the Board would continue to make judgments on a case-by-case basis. The
30 Chairman asked if the Board was still interested in receiving summary input from the
31 Conservation Commission with regard to the original two questions that were asked. Mark
32 Suennen answered yes. He referred to the Master Plan, Appendix D, 1998 Local Resource
33 Protection Priorities as well as Appendix E, 2004 Local Resource Protection Priorities Updates.
34 He suggested that the Conservation Commission review the table of the 17 identified areas of
35 Town that should be protected and narrow it down to the top 10 areas. The Coordinator offered
36 to give background information with regard to the lists Mark Suennen had referenced. She
37 advised that in 1998 the State had started the LCIP program and subsequently had changed it to
38 the LCHIP program, Land and Community Heritage Investment Program. She explained that in
39 order to convince the State to put money towards the program all the towns in the region
40 scrambled to have their Open Space Committees, Conservation Commissions, Planning Boards
41 and Boards of Selectmen quickly put together lists of projects. She further explained that if grant
42 money was available it could be used to maintain the listed properties. She indicated that the
43 huge lists were compiled "to hit the State over the head" and prove that money was needed at a

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2013 Meetings**

June 11, 2013

1 **ZONING/SUBDIVISION/SPR QUESTIONS, cont.**

2
3 local level to accomplish the projects. She stated that the update had been completed when the
4 name of the program changed and the list had been reviewed and updated simply to not have the
5 funding taken away. She advised that the program was funded through \$25.00 fees for certain
6 types of documents or plans that were recorded at the Registry of Deeds. She noted that every
7 year the funding was cut and every year there were not enough funds to complete the projects.
8 She indicated that some of the areas in New Boston's list may be valid areas to protect, however,
9 some of the buildings listed were not appropriate to this discussion. Mark Suennen agreed with
10 the Coordinator the buildings listed were not appropriate to the discussion, however, there were
11 areas on the list that were appropriate, i.e., Great Meadows Corridor, Beaver Meadow, Shaky
12 Pond and Parker Road/Riverdale Road.

13 The Chairman asked if the Coordinator understood what the response should be from the
14 Board. The Coordinator answered yes but indicated that she was worried about providing the
15 Conservation Commission with the lists suggested by Mark Suennen. She stated that she would
16 like to review the Open Space Plan as there may be more current goals that would be appropriate
17 to this discussion. The Chairman asked that the Coordinator create a response for review at the
18 next Planning Board meeting.

19 The Chairman indicated that the Coordinator had created a memorandum that listed the
20 Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations questions that the Board had
21 previously discussed. He referred to page 6 of the memorandum and read the following Zoning
22 Ordinance question, "The Recreational Camping Parks section dates back to 1989 with only
23 minor changes since that time. Christine Quirk had mentioned that it is antiquated. Is it worth
24 looking at some other communities' ordinances to see what might be done?" He wanted to make
25 sure this question was discussed while Christine Quirk was sitting on the Planning Board as the
26 Board of Selectmen representative. Christine Quirk commented that she would like to see more
27 rules and regulations made with the Planning Board. She noted that currently everything had to
28 be done through the Zoning Board. The Chairman asked if Christine Quirk would be on the
29 Planning Board through the end of August. Christine Quirk answered yes and noted that she
30 could always come back for the discussion if it did not occur while she was sitting on the Board.

31 Mark Suennen asked if the Recreational Camping Parks section could be found in the
32 Non-Residential Site Plan Review Regulations. The Coordinator clarified that the Recreational
33 Camping Parks section was located in the Zoning Ordinance. The Board decided to discuss this
34 question during the August 27, 2013, meeting.

35 Mark Suennen asked Christine Quirk was aware of any communities that currently had
36 good regulations with regard to Recreational Camping Parks. Christine Quirk answered no. She
37 continued that campgrounds were in between being residential and commercial. She stated that
38 it would be nice to be able to come to the Planning Board instead of the ZBA in situations where
39 she may want to put up a permanent "log cabin on wheels". She commented that campgrounds
40 were so heavily regulated by the State that she did not think many new campgrounds would be
41 opening anyway.

42 The Chairman asked if the State campgrounds were governed by the same regulations as
43 privately owned campgrounds. Christine Quirk answered no and gave an example that State

June 11, 2013

1 **ZONING/SUBDIVISION/SPR QUESTIONS, cont.**

2
3 campgrounds were permitted to have open campfire pits while privately owned campgrounds
4 were required to have metal fire rings.

5 The Chairman stated that the Board needed to pick one of the listed questions to discuss
6 this evening. The Coordinator suggested that the Board review the questions that had been
7 discussed at previous meetings and finalize those discussions.

8 David Litwinovich noted that Don Duhaime had not been present during the Steep Slopes
9 discussion. Don Duhaime indicated that he had read through the meeting minutes and was happy
10 with what had been discussed. The Chairman stated that it was the consensus of the Board to
11 leave the Steep Slopes ordinance as it was currently written.

12 The Chairman asked if anyone had reviewed Section 401.5 and had any thoughts on
13 developer incentives for open space. Mark Suennen stated that it seemed that the current
14 incentives gave 5% for this and 5% for that. He noted that 5% was the same as saying 1:20. He
15 stated that big subdivisions in New Boston usually included 25 homes. He questioned what the
16 incentive would be for a developer to be allowed to build a 26th house. He did not believe that
17 the incentives were doing what they were intended to do, i.e., create an open space development.
18 Don Duhaime asked if the Twin Bridge Subdivision was an open space subdivision. Mark
19 Suennen answered yes. The Chairman stated that the Twin Bridge Subdivision had reduced the
20 number of lots that they had originally planned. Christine Quirk pointed out that the number of
21 lots had been reduced in order to have the proposed cul-de-sac. The Coordinator noted that the
22 Board always required that an applicant reduce the proposed amount of lots in exchange for
23 longer cul-de-sac lengths. She added that Section 401.5 had never been used.

24 Mark Suennen wondered if there were other, more appropriate incentives as the Board
25 was not willing to budge on density. He suggested that one incentive could be speedier time
26 with regard to the Planning Board process. He proposed that an applicant be provided a six
27 meeting limit and therefore the applicant would have an approval or denial by the sixth meeting.

28 The Coordinator commented that she did not like the incentives and believed they should
29 no longer be used. She questioned if the open space that the Town would get was worth an
30 additional house lot. The Chairman suggested that instead of using a 5% incentive it be
31 increased to 10%. Mark Suennen stated that the permitted density needed to be reviewed. He
32 surmised that the developer would be trying to squeeze more lots onto less space. The
33 Coordinator pointed out that it could be done because density was based on the underlying
34 district and lots as small as one acre were permitted in an open space subdivision. She noted that
35 they rarely went as small one acre due to land restrictions.

36 Don Duhaime pointed out that all of the open space subdivisions ended up having cul-de-
37 sacs. He did not believe that the Board should be giving incentives to increase the number of
38 lots and that the Board should be reducing the density. Mark Suennen stated that he agreed with
39 Don Duhaime if an open space subdivision with a cul-de-sac was being proposed. Christine
40 Quirk asked if the density had been reduced on the three open space subdivisions with cul-de-
41 sacs. Mark Suennen indicated that the density was reduced on at least one of the subdivisions.
42 The Coordinator believed that through Board discussions density had been reduced with regard
43 to the open space subdivisions with cul-de-sacs.

June 11, 2013

1 **ZONING/SUBDIVISION/SPR QUESTIONS, cont.**

2
3 The Chairman indicated that he did not want to mix the density for a cul-de-sac and
4 density for an open space subdivisions completely. Don Duhaime stated that the two tied
5 together. The Chairman disagreed and explained that an open space subdivision did not have to
6 have a cul-de-sac. Don Duhaime noted that the Board had yet to see an open space subdivision
7 without a cul-de-sac. The Chairman acknowledged Don Duhaime's point, however, he noted
8 that there was nothing in the regulations that required a cul-de-sac be built for open space
9 subdivisions. He stated that the requirement for reducing density for longer cul-de-sacs belonged
10 in the cul-de-sac regulations and not in the open space regulations. Mark Suennen asked if the
11 Forest View Subdivision was an open space subdivision. The Coordinator answered yes. Mark
12 Suennen noted that a through road had been proposed for the Forest View Subdivision.

13 Don Duhaime believed that density should be reduced for open space subdivisions and he
14 believed that the minimum lot size should be increased from one acre to two acres. The
15 Coordinator stated that increasing the minimum lot size from one acre to two acres would create
16 a conventional subdivision with open space. She explained that the idea of an open space
17 subdivision was to cluster the lots together and make the infrastructure needed smaller.

18 The Chairman stated that if increasing the incentive amount from 5% to 10% was not
19 practical then maybe it was not worth having those incentives. Mark Suennen believed it was
20 worth asking the Conservation Commission for their thoughts on reasonable incentives. He
21 noted that all of the current incentives were relative to density and he wondered if there were
22 other incentives that did not involve density. The Chairman asked if Mark Suennen had any
23 thoughts on other incentives that did not involve density. Mark Suennen reiterated his earlier
24 suggestion of a limit of six Planning Board meetings. The Coordinator advised that placing a
25 limit on meetings would not work. She explained that a lot of matters that the Board typically
26 reviewed would then be left to others to complete without Board review, i.e., engineering review,
27 staff decisions without Board input simply to fit within the schedule. She stated that lots of
28 communities operated in such a way and the Planning Board ultimately signed off on the end.
29 She referenced past subdivisions where it had taken an entire year to review and approve. She
30 did not believe that taking a year to complete the necessary work was a bad thing as the Board
31 had gone through everything and was able to justify their approvals. She stated that the Board
32 would not be as hands on as they were with a six meeting limit. The Chairman noted that Mark
33 Suennen's suggestion was a feasible incentive that did not involve density. Mark Suennen
34 agreed but pointed out that although it would be feasible, it might be impractical.

35 Mark Suennen offered an additional feasible incentive of waiving or reducing fees. He
36 noted that he would not support such an incentive but nonetheless, it was feasible. The
37 Coordinator pointed out that fees had recently been increased.

38 Mark Suennen suggested that it be pointed out to the Conservation Commission that the
39 density incentives did not seem to be working and ask them to provide the Board with other
40 incentives that might encourage open space subdivisions.

41 The Chairman asked for further comments and/or questions. David Litwinovich believed
42 it would be a good idea to see what other towns used as incentives to encourage open space
43 subdivisions. The Chairman asked if the Coordinator could gather the requested information

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2013 Meetings**

June 11, 2013

1 **ZONING/SUBDIVISION/SPR QUESTIONS, cont.**

2
3 from other towns that were similar to New Boston.

4 The Chairman asked the Board to review the landscaping question for discussion at the
5 next meeting.

6
7 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF**
8 **June 11, 2013.**

9
10 2a. Letter dated May 30, 2013, from Scott Whitney, re: request to change current approved
11 business use on Tax Map/Lot #3/150, 636 North Mast Road, Unit A, for the Board's
12 review and discussion. (Scott Whitney to be present)

13
14 2b. Copy of ZBA Notice of Decision dated 10/18/88, copy of Application for Site Plan
15 Review and section copy of the current approved site plan, for the Board's information.

16
17 Present in the audience was Scott Whitney.

18 The Chairman asked if a retail use was currently approved at the above-referenced
19 property. Scott Whitney answered yes. The Chairman asked for the type of retail. Scott
20 Whitney explained that the unit he rented was approved for a retail use and that he was unaware
21 of the retail use approval until after he moved his business to the space. He indicated that he
22 wanted the use changed from retail to automotive repair.

23 The Chairman asked if Mr. Whitney wanted to operate as a licensed firearm dealer from
24 the same location as the automotive repair. Scott Whitney answered yes and he added that
25 firearm sales was more of a hobby and there would be no signage or regular foot traffic related to
26 the selling of firearms. He explained that a few of his friends purchased firearms from him.
27 Mark Suennen asked if Mr. Whitney had been selling firearms out of his home. Scott Whitney
28 answered, no, and stated that he had sold firearms from his business that had been located in
29 Manchester, NH.

30 The Chairman stated that the Board needed to determine the degree of formality that
31 would be required to change the use from retail to automotive repair. He noted that Scott
32 Whitney was not the owner of the property located at Tax Map/Lot #3/150, 636 North Mast
33 Road, Unit A, and asked the Coordinator what involvement was required of the owner. The
34 Coordinator explained that the owner needed to be willing to sign the application and go through
35 the process. The Chairman asked if Mr. Whitney was on good terms with the owner. Scott
36 Whitney answered, yes, and added that the owner had given him permission to speak on his
37 behalf.

38 The Chairman asked if there was any State permitting involved with an automotive repair
39 business. Scott Whitney answered, yes, and indicated that he had a State Inspection License. He
40 added that the he had reapplied as a new inspection station and there was a delay because of this
41 matter.

42 The Coordinator advised that the site was originally approved with two units, one for
43 equipment rentals and the other motorcycle service and parts for Milwaukee Ironworks. She

June 11, 2013

1 MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

2
3 continued that a third unit was created and Accelerated Automotive operated from the location.
4 She added that up the driveway Cold Springs Annex was located for automotive repair for RVs.
5 She stated that changing the use from retail to automotive repair would not be changing the
6 character of the area as it was all currently automotive. The Chairman did not question that this
7 was a good thing to do, however, he believed the site plan needed to be updated to represent
8 what currently existed at the property. The Planning Board Assistant asked if Mr. Whitney had
9 viewed the site plan and if he was aware of any changes. Scott Whitney stated that he had seen
10 the site plan and there were no changes to the property. He stated that the previous tenant
11 operated an automotive repair business but had not contacted the Planning Board. He advised
12 that he first learned of the use issue when he was applying for a sign permit. The Chairman
13 asked if the lighting, signs and/or parking had changed since 1996. Scott Whitney answered that
14 nothing had changed. Mark Suennen asked if the hours of operation were the same. Scott
15 Whitney answered yes.

16 The Chairman stated that the only change that needed to be made to the site plan was
17 changing the line "Unit A = retail space" to "Unit A = automotive repair/firearms sales". The
18 Coordinator pointed out that there was a separate issue with adding the firearm sales. She
19 explained that mixed use was not permitted in the Commercial District. The Chairman asked if
20 Mr. Whitney would be willing to be approved for the automotive repair and firearms sales in two
21 steps. Scott Whitney answered yes and explained that the firearms sales were secondary and
22 currently he was not allowed to conduct sales until ATF inspected the unit.

23 The Chairman stated that the Board would proceed by doing the approval in two steps
24 and he indicated that Mr. Whitney may or may not be approved for the firearms sales. He stated
25 that to make the 1996 site plan correct the line "Unit A = retail space" needed to be changed to
26 "Unit A = automotive repair". He asked if the hours of operation were between 7:30 a.m. and
27 5:30 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Scott Whitney answered yes. The Coordinator asked if
28 Mr. Whitney conducted vehicular sales. Scott Whitney answered no.

29 The Chairman asked Mr. Whitney to take the site plan and compare it to the actual site
30 and indicate any necessary changes to ensure that it was current. Mark Suennen asked if the
31 Chairman wanted Mr. Whitney to view the entire building or only Unit A. The Chairman asked
32 for the entire building to be viewed.

33 The Coordinator advised that Unit A had been granted a Special Exception for changing
34 the use from well drilling to rental and sales. Mark Suennen stated that they would have to go
35 through the ZBA if the Special Exception was required. The Coordinator explained that the
36 Board could make an interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance that it did not need to go any further
37 with regard to the Special Exception. She continued that the decision could be appealed. Mark
38 Suennen asked if the appeal would go to the ZBA. The Coordinator answered yes.

39
40 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to interpret the Zoning Ordinance for Tax Map/Lot #3/150, 636
41 North Mast Road, Unit A, that there was an existing proposed vehicular repair facility
42 within the existing building, therefore, the Special Exception was assumed to be
43 previously approved and Unit A, therefore, fell under that same Special Exception

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2013 Meetings**

June 11, 2013

1 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.**

2
3 approval. Don Duhaime seconded the motion. **Discussion:** Don Duhaime questioned if
4 the Board should eliminate the approved retail use from the unit due to Mr. Whitney's
5 intention to operate as a licensed firearms dealer from the location. The Chairman stated
6 that he was trying not to mix the two at this point. Mark Suennen commented that Mr.
7 Whitney would be operating a vehicular repair facility and the Board was clarifying that
8 it was permitted at the location. He continued that if Mr. Whitney asked to operate a
9 second business out of the same unit, a bigger discussion was required. Don Duhaime
10 stated that he was fine with requiring Mr. Whitney to come back to discuss the additional
11 use. The motion **PASSED** unanimously.

12
13 Mark Suennen stated that Mr. Whitney did not have to go to the ZBA to convert Unit A
14 to a vehicular repair facility.

15 The Chairman asked how the Board was going to move forward with the review/approval
16 of the vehicular repair facility in Unit A. Mark Suennen believed that having Mr. Whitney
17 certify that the site plan matched the current conditions satisfied the review/approval
18 requirements.

19 The Chairman asked if the line "Unit A = retail space" should be changed to "Unit A =
20 retail space/vehicular repair facility" or "Unit A = vehicular repair facility". It was Mark
21 Suennen's opinion that the use was being converted from retail space to vehicular repair facility
22 and as such the line should read "Unit A = vehicular repair facility".

23 The Chairman stated that the three conditions of approval were that the hours of
24 operation stayed the same, the definition of the line of the plan would read "Unit A = vehicular
25 repair facility" and that Mr. Whitney would update the existing plan as an as-built within thirty
26 days. The Coordinator pointed out that no one was allowed to write on the site plan because it
27 had been completed by an engineer. She stated that something would need to be attached to the
28 original site plan with the updates. Don Duhaime suggested that a copy of the plan be made and
29 the changes could be made to the copy.

30
31 Mark Suennen **MOVED** that, conditioned upon the applicant writing a letter that certifies
32 that the hours of operation will remain the same, the use is changing and providing an up-
33 to-date as-built amendment is submitted, the Board approves the change in use from
34 "Retail" to "Vehicular Repair Facility" for Tax Map/Lot #3/150, NH Route 114/North
35 Mast Road, Unit A. Don Duhaime seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

36
37 The Board took a three minute recess.

- 38
39 1. Approval of the May 14, 2013, minutes distributed by email.

40
41 The Chairman stated that he had three questions with regard to the May 14, 2013,
42 minutes. He referred to the fifth paragraph of the garden center hearing and noted that there was
43 no response to a question he asked about requiring a Stormwater Management Plan. The

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2013 Meetings**

June 11, 2013

1 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.**

2
3 Coordinator advised that the question was unanswered and was addressed at the following
4 meeting.

5 The Chairman referred to the home healthcare facility hearing and questioned if the
6 abutter with the adjoining lot owned more than the 15 acres that was represented in the minutes.
7 Christine Quirk confirmed that the abutter owned 15 acres.

8 The Chairman referred to the Sizemore hearing and pointed to the last paragraph. He did
9 not like the sentence that stated “The Board felt the information presented was reasonable.” He
10 requested that it be changed to “the proposal was reasonable” or “the plan was reasonable” or
11 “the information was complete”.

12
13 David Litwinovich **MOVED** to approve the minutes of May 14, 2013, as amended. Don
14 Duhaime seconded the motion and it **PASSED**. AYE – Don Duhaime, David
15 Litwinovich. ABSTAINED – Mark Suennen.

- 16
17 3. Confirmation of site stabilization for Eco-Smith Recyclers, Tax Map/Lot #6/40-1-1,
18 Byam Road, for the Board’s review and discussion.

19
20 The Chairman stated that the Board members had driven by the property and believed
21 that stabilization had been established.

22
23 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to confirm site stabilization for Eco-Smith Recyclers, Tax
24 Map/Lot #6/40-1-1, Byam Road. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it
25 **PASSED** unanimously.

- 26
27 4a. Memorandum dated May 29, 2013, from Nic Strong, Planning Coordinator, to Stu
28 Lewin, Chair, and Planning Board Members, re: Christian Farm Drive, for the Board’s
29 information.

- 30
31 4b. Memorandum dated May 29, 2013, from Shannon Silver, Planning Board Assistant, to
32 Peter Flynn, Town Administrator & Board of Selectmen, re: Douglas Hill-Letter of
33 Credit-Christian Farm Drive, for the Board’s information.

34
35 The Chairman addressed items 4a and 4b together as they were related. He stated that the
36 closing for the Christian Farm Drive lots was held and it was determined that the road was not
37 included in the purchase of the lots. He noted that Douglas Hill continued to own the road,
38 Christian Farm Drive.

39 The Chairman asked Christine Quirk if there had been any discussion with regard to
40 core testing to find out what was causing the cracking in the road. Christine Quirk answered, no.

- 41
42 5. Copy of HB 278 – as amended by the Senate, 2013, session for the Board’s information.
43

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2013 Meetings

June 11, 2013

1 MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

2

3 The Chairman asked if the above-referenced House Bill as well as the Senate and House
4 Bills identified in items 6, 7, and 8 had passed. The Coordinator answered yes and explained
5 that as long as the Governor did not veto any of them they would become law.

6 The Chairman noted that it was now allowed to install fire sprinklers voluntarily. He
7 further noted that the Board needed to discuss updating the regulations.

8

9 6. Copy of SB 49 – as amended by the House, 2013, session for the Board’s information.

10

11 The Chairman advised that the above-reference SB required that instead of an appeal
12 going directly to court it had to go to the ZBA. The Coordinator explained that previously
13 appeals had to be dual-tracked in order to not lose time on one or the other. She continued that
14 SB-49 clarified that an applicant has to appeal to the ZBA before appealing to the court.

15

16 7. Copy of HB 634 – as amended by the Senate, 2013, session for the Board’s information.

17

18 The Chairman stated that the above-referenced HB was relative to the Water Resource
19 Protection Plans.

20

21 8. Copy of SB 101 – as amended by the House, 2013, session for the Board’s information.

22

23 The Chairman noted that the above-reference SB was relative to wireless
24 telecommunications matters. The Coordinator advised that Zoning may need to be updated to
25 reflect the changes.

26

27 9. Article, titled: *Neighbors Calling Foul over Fowl*, published in the Weekly Market
28 Bulletin, June 5, 2013, edition, for the Board’s information.

29

30 The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion
31 occurred.

32

33 10. **Read File:** Notice of Public Hearing from the Town of Goffstown, re: proposal to co-
34 locate 3 antennas and 6 radio heads to existing antennas.

35

36 The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion
37 occurred.

38

39 11. Distribution of the May 28, 2013, minutes for approval with or without changes at the
40 June 25, 2013, meeting.

41

42 The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion
43 occurred.

June 11, 2013

1 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.**

2
3 12a. Letter received June 7, 2013, from Kevin M. Leonard, P.E., Northpoint Engineering, to
4 Nic Strong, Planning Coordinator, re: Twin Bridge Estates-Phase II – Bond Release #5
5 Recommendation, for the Board’s action.

6
7 12b. Subdivision/Site Plan Guarantee Release Worksheet received June 7, 2013, for Twin
8 Bridge Estate, Phase II, for the Board’s information.

9
10 The Chairman addressed items 12a and 12b together as they were related.

11 The Chairman stated that development of this subdivision had and continued to be
12 outside the bounds of the plan approval and AoT permit. He indicated that he had driven by the
13 subdivision this evening and although they were making progress, they were still way outside the
14 5 acre limit of disturbed and not stabilized area. He further indicated that although the contractor
15 had stated that the driveway aprons would be used for access, equipment had been tracked off
16 the edges of the road. He believed that the Board should consider not releasing the entire amount
17 that was recommended by the Town Engineer.

18 Christine Quirk stated that the Board had given the applicant two weeks to stabilize the
19 area and they had not. She went on to say that she and Dwight Lovejoy had viewed the
20 subdivision five days earlier and it was her opinion that not a lot of work had been completed.

21 Don Duhaime suggested that one-third of the requested bond reduction amount be held
22 until the stabilization was completed. Christine Quirk asked if the entire requested bond
23 reduction amount could be held. The Coordinator suggested that the Board release the binder
24 amount.

25 The Chairman stated that there was questionable site work money being released as well
26 as money for the paving, guardrails and other items that had been completed. He stated that the
27 Board could choose not to release the amount suggested by the Town Engineer, or could release
28 a certain percentage of the requested amount to be released or could keep a larger contingency.
29 He commented that he did not believe that the Board could decide to keep the entire amount.

30 Mark Suennen stated that it sounded like the Chairman was most concerned about
31 releasing the site work item. The Chairman indicated that he was concerned about the Town
32 having to fix work that may not be completed by the developer. He continued that he was not
33 convinced that there was enough money in the site work item to fix the issues that existed. Mark
34 Suennen suggested that item 3, G, ii to do with drainage swales also be reviewed.

35 The Chairman reiterated the previously stated options. Mark Suennen stated that he
36 would not be in favor of increasing the contingency as there was no basis to do so. He believed
37 that referring to Section 1 and Section 3, G, ii, offered the Board the justification that those items
38 were not suitably ready to be released.

39 The Board deducted the amounts from Section 1 and Section 3, G, ii, from the Town
40 Engineer's suggested bond reduction amount and determined that the amount to be released was
41 \$236,408.13. The Chairman asked if the remainder of Twin Bridge Estates-Phase II – Bond
42 Release #5 would be released once the developer proved compliance. Mark Suennen believed
43 that a new bond release request should be submitted for additional funds to be released.

June 11, 2013

1 MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

2
3 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to execute Bond Release #5 in the amount of \$236,408.13. The
4 Board determined that due to ongoing excavation there were still significant site work
5 issues with the project and, therefore, the Board was not releasing money on the site work
6 item 1 and swale drainage item 3, G, ii. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it
7 **PASSED** unanimously.
8

9 13. Request to Reconsider Incremental Inspection Escrow Deposits.
10

11 The Coordinator advised that the developers for the Twin Bridge Subdivision were
12 allowed by the Board to maintain their construction escrow account through installments.
13 She stated that a letter had been sent advising the developer that the account was below the
14 agreed upon balance and needed to be replenished with the remaining installment. She explained
15 that the developer had not answered the letter and indicated that they had not received the letter.
16 She noted that a new letter had been sent and received.

17 The Coordinator stated that the balance in the escrow account was less than what
18 was needed to cover the invoices that had already been received.

19 The Coordinator pleaded with the Board to not allow escrow accounts to be maintained
20 through installments. She stated that if a developer did not have enough money for the
21 inspection escrow they should not be allowed to do their subdivision. She indicated that
22 monitoring of the account through phone calls, and letter and the stress involved was not worth
23 it.

24 The Coordinator stated that a partial payment had been made to the Town Engineer,
25 however, inspections had stopped and would not resume until the installment was made. She
26 noted that the developer would most likely not have any money to put into the escrow account
27 until they closed on one of the houses.

28 Mark Suennen asked what type of bond was used for the subdivision. The Coordinator
29 answered that the bond was in the form of a letter of credit. Mark Suennen asked if that freed
30 up some cash. The Coordinator answered no and explained that the developer was using that
31 money to pay the contractor.
32

33 14. Bussiere Subdivision, Indian Falls and Susan Roads.
34

35 Don Duhaime stated that he had read through the Town Engineer's April daily reports for
36 the Bussiere Subdivision. He indicated that a discussion had taken place with Thibeault Corp.
37 and now it was June and nothing had happened. The Coordinator confirmed that nothing had
38 happened. Don Duhaime asked if Emile Bussiere had met with the Planning Board. The
39 Coordinator answered no and explained that he would call to schedule a time to meet if he felt he
40 needed to.
41

42 15. Chairman question to the Board.
43

June 11, 2013

1 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.**

2
3 The Chairman indicated that he had read through the last several meeting minutes and
4 found that he did a great deal of talking during the public hearings. He questioned if the Board
5 wanted to consider changing how the public hearings were run and offered a suggestion that
6 Board members would be assigned applications to be responsible for during the meetings.

7 Christine Quirk commented that the Chairman did a great job during the meetings. Mark
8 Suennen stated that he was perfectly happy having the Chairman read important aspects of the
9 public hearing into the record. Don Duhaim and David Litwinovich agreed with Mark
10 Suennen. Don Duhaim added that the Chairman stated the topic of the hearings and did not
11 ramble. David Litwinovich commented that it helped the audience members to have someone
12 “driving the bus”. The Chairman was happy to let someone else “drive the bus”.

13 It was determined that the Chairman would continue to head the public hearings.
14

15 **Continued discussion, re: starting work on cul-de-sac issue**

16
17 The Chairman stated that there was a two step process that needed to be followed with
18 regard to cul-de-sacs. He indicated that the first step was to prove that there could not be a
19 through road and the second step was to allow a cul-de-sac up to the 1,000’ maximum. He
20 pointed out that the Board had been requiring that applicants prove that a through road could be
21 built and then allowing a cul-de-sac and in most instances the length exceeded the 1,000’
22 maximum. He stated that the issues with the way the Board had been handling cul-de-sacs were
23 that they had not been following the regulations, precedent was being set and other stakeholders
24 in the Town were being agitated.

25 The Chairman advised that the Board could leave things at the status quo, modify the
26 behavior of the Board to follow the regulations as written, or modify the Subdivision
27 Regulations. He went on to say that if the Board modified the Subdivision Regulations the
28 following issues should be addressed:

- 29
- 30 • Allow longer lengths
 - 31 • Change the process
 - 32 • Explicit trades and conditions
 - 33 • Extra requirements
 - 34 ○ Underground utilities
 - 35 ○ No under road drains to a certain depth
 - 36 ○ Regular rotaries and bump-outs at 1,000’ length
 - 37 ○ Divider roads
 - 38 ○ Wider roads
 - 39 ○ Lower density (larger lots/frontage)
 - 40 ○ No back lots
 - 41 ○ Open space
 - 42 ○ Maximum driveway lengths.

43 The Chairman stated that when he had first come on the Board he had completed research
from around the country and the minutes reflected that Planning Boards wrestled with the notion

June 11, 2013

1 **CUL-DE-SACS, cont.**

2
3 of trading things in spite of the regulations. He indicated that he tried to find an authority on cul-
4 de-sac lengths but was unsuccessful. He noted that surrounding towns varied with regard to
5 maximum lengths and some towns did not even have limits. He added that one town in NH had
6 a section in their regulations that addressed trade-offs for approval of longer cul-de-sacs. He
7 advised that he reviewed the NFPA standards and found recommendations for limiting the
8 number of households based on the number of access routes.

9 The Chairman stated that the Board had to make a determination on the cul-de-sac matter
10 by the end of the year.

11 Don Duhaime referred to Wright Drive and questioned the reasons the Board had to deny
12 the through road that had been proposed by the developer. Mark Suennen stated that one of the
13 key considerations for the through road was that it would have to connect to West Lull Place and
14 West Lull Place did not meet Town regulations. The Coordinator noted that no discussion took
15 place with regard to how West Lull Place could be changed to meet the regulations. Mark
16 Suennen believed that the Conservation Commission had not been in favor of the through road
17 because of the need for a culvert across the waterway and decisions to have a cul-de-sac were
18 made prior to the submission of the application. Don Duhaime reiterated that the Conservation
19 Commission took steps beyond their remit. The Coordinator clarified that the Conservation
20 Commission had been approached by the Russell Foundation in the process of trying to work
21 through conservation and open space issues. She continued that the Conservation Commission
22 had been asked their opinion about the cul-de-sac plan and they endorsed it.

23 Don Duhaime believed that if there was an access in and out of a property it was up to the
24 developer to make the through road work. He commented that the Board needed to sit hard on
25 through roads and stop giving in to cul-de-sacs.

26 The Chairman posed a hypothetical situation in which a developer proved that a through
27 road could not be built and was now allowed to construct a cul-de-sac. He asked Don Duhaime
28 for his thoughts on allowing a 1,000' cul-de-sac. Don Duhaime answered that he was happy that
29 the Board stuck to the rules and regulations. The Chairman asked if the cul-de-sac could be
30 longer than 1,000'. Don Duhaime stated that he was not against a 1,500' cul-de-sac, however, he
31 was not in favor of allowing an almost 3,000' cul-de-sac with too many houses on top of the road
32 and on back lots. The Chairman asked for Don Duhaime's thoughts if there was no cul-de-sac
33 length limitation but the density could not be increased over the 1,000' density maximum and no
34 back lots would be allowed. Don Duhaime stated that he would have to look into the matter
35 further. He indicated that he started having issues with cul-de-sacs that were over 2,000' in
36 length.

37 The Chairman asked for the Board's thoughts on requiring underground utilities for cul-
38 de-sacs. Don Duhaime questioned if underground utilities were currently required. Mark
39 Suennen answered no. Don Duhaime thought that PSNH required underground utilities. Mark
40 Suennen commented that PSNH liked underground utilities but they were not required. Don
41 Duhaime thought that underground utilities were a good idea.

42 The Chairman asked for opinions on requiring a turnaround or bumpout every 1,000' to
43 accommodate the Fire Department. Don Duhaime stated that the diameter would need to be

June 11, 2013

1 **CUL-DE-SACS, cont.**

2
3 determined by the Road Agent.

4 Christine Quirk asked for Jim Brace, Police Chief's, thoughts on cul-de-sac lengths. The
5 Chairman stated that Jim Brace, Police Chief, did not buy into the hostage situation issue
6 because those types of situations with similar conditions could happen in places other than cul-
7 de-sacs. He continued that Jim Brace, Police Chief, did not believe the density should increase
8 with the length of the cul-de-sac. Mark Suennen added that Jim Brace, Police Chief, lived on a
9 cul-de-sac. Christine Quirk commented that she lived on a cul-de-sac as well. The Chairman
10 stated that the current Police Chief's views were different from the previous police chief and he
11 wondered if the same was true with regard to the Road Agent. Christine Quirk thought it was a
12 good question to ask the Road Agent.

13 The Chairman asked for Christine Quirk's opinion on cul-de-sacs. Christine Quirk stated
14 that she was not against cul-de-sacs that were longer than the 1,000'. She stated that she was
15 interested in hearing from the new Department Managers in Town. She further stated that she
16 agreed that back lots should not be permitted.

17 The Chairman asked for David Litwinovich's thoughts on cul-de-sacs. David
18 Litwinovich commented that he liked that idea of limiting cul-de-sac length to 1,000' and
19 creating incentives to keep the length at 1,000'. He believed that concessions should be made on
20 the part of the applicant to get approval for cul-de-sacs that were longer than 1,000'. The
21 Chairman asked if the 1,000' length was magical or was it because it was the maximum length in
22 the regulation. David Litwinovich answered that he was in favor of a set amount of length that
23 everyone felt was appropriate. Don Duhaime commented that the Board should stick to the
24 regulations that they created. Christine Quirk added that the rules for cul-de-sacs should be
25 listed under cul-de-sacs in the regulations. Don Duhaime suggested that a cistern be required
26 every 1,000'.

27 The Chairman asked for Mark Suennen's thoughts on cul-de-sacs. Mark Suennen stated
28 that he was very conflicted on the matter of cul-de-sacs. It was his opinion, from a transportation
29 perspective, that through roads were better than cul-de-sacs. He understood, however, that
30 people did not necessarily want to live on through roads and he was not going to take away a
31 developer's ability to build cul-de-sacs. He did believe that the regulations need to be changed.
32 He read the following statement from the Subdivision Regulations, was not true, "The New
33 Boston Planning Board does not allow for the construction of non-connecting public rights-of-
34 way".

35 Mark Suennen stated that he preferred a through road in general but if a developer
36 wanted to build Workforce Housing Subdivision on a cul-de-sac with sidewalks he was not
37 going to stop them from doing it. He continued that he would be in favor of requiring a
38 dedicated right-of-way for the construction of a through road in the future. He believed that it
39 was important to codify the rules that were being discussed. He stated that he would not be in
40 favor of codifying longer than 1,000' because cul-de-sacs longer than 1,000' needed to be done
41 on a case-by-case basis. The Chairman asked if 1,000' should be the maximum. Mark Suennen
42 answered that he was willing to accept the status quo that somewhere along the line the Board
43 had decided upon 1,000' as the maximum.

June 11, 2013

1 **CUL-DE-SACS, cont.**

2
3 The Chairman asked for further comments and/or questions. The Coordinator referred to
4 the section of the Subdivision Regulations that Mark Suennen had previously read and pointed
5 out that section that immediately followed addressed an exception to the statement. She stated
6 that Mark Suennen was talking about a philosophy that differed from the one that was put in the
7 Regulations. She continued that the Board, at the time, did not want non-connecting roads and
8 the exception was only made if it could be proven that the road could not physically be
9 connected to any other roads. Mark Suennen stated that he would change the Regulations to
10 match the different philosophy that was being discussed which was that cul-de-sacs were an
11 acceptable roadway for a development with certain conditions. He added that cul-de-sacs were
12 not preferred but they were an acceptable option. The Coordinator asked if the portion of the
13 regulation that required a through road to be proved would remain in the regulation. Mark
14 Suennen answered, no. He stated that he did not vote to allow for Wright Drive to become a cul-
15 de-sac. He indicated that there was not enough discussion about what needed to be done to West
16 Lull Place to make Wright Drive a through road. Don Duhaime believed that it was up to the
17 Board to require that the developer make whatever road improvements were needed to make the
18 road safe and passable.

19 The Chairman asked if it would be required that land be set aside for the connection of a
20 through road for any approved cul-de-sac that had the possibility of connecting to a through road.
21 Mark Suennen said, yes, and added that he would also require that permits for wetland crossings
22 be obtained and the crossing be constructed. Don Duhaime commented that he liked Mark
23 Suennen's idea. The Coordinator pointed out an issue that when a road right-of way was
24 dedicated on a plan it was not deeded at that time. She explained that paper roads went away
25 after twenty years and the land underneath reverted to property owners on each side. Don
26 Duhaime stated that the Town had to sign off on those things. The Coordinator clarified that the
27 Town did not have to sign off because they were never built. Don Duhaime pointed out that the
28 City of Manchester required that the Planning Board and the Mayor approve the release of a
29 paper street before it went away. The Chairman asked that the Coordinator look into how
30 Manchester dealt with paper roads. Mark Suennen stated that if a paper road was deeded as a
31 town land it could not revert back. The Coordinator agreed with Mark Suennen and pointed out
32 that the land was not being deeded at the time of subdivision.

33 The Coordinator asked for confirmation that Mark Suennen would not want people to
34 fight for cul-de-sacs and that it should be a right. She further asked if Mark Suennen would try
35 and make people build through roads if he believed there should be one or provide the access for
36 the future through road. Mark Suennen confirmed the Coordinator's statements. The Chairman
37 asked if the developer would have to demonstrate the possibility of a through road. Mark
38 Suennen answered, yes.

39 David Litwinovich asked what the advantage was of not making someone put in a
40 through road that could be built. The Chairman answered that the advantage was building a cul-
41 de-sac because they were nice places to live. Mark Suennen stated that it was about private
42 property rights. He stated that a developer had the right to develop his property in the manner
43 that was fitting for his economic benefit. David Litwinovich stated that it was an advantage for

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2013 Meetings**

18

June 11, 2013

1 **CUL-DE-SACS, cont.**

2
3 the developer. The Chairman commented that it was an advantage for potential property owners
4 because for some living on a cul-de-sac was desirable. The Coordinator stated that there needed
5 to be a balance of private rights and public purpose. She added that there was a valid purpose for
6 having a through road: connecting networks of streets. She stated that there was always a
7 balance between what was a valid public purpose and things that were going to best for everyone
8 against the property rights of an individual. She advised that the Board was going to have to be
9 careful crafting the regulations if they were going in the direction of the discussion. She stated
10 that the regulations should not be totally on the side of the developer and ignore the public
11 purposes that are related to a connected network of streets in the Town of New Boston. She
12 pointed out that the Board had worked very hard to get Indian Falls Road, Susan Road, McCurdy
13 Road and Carriage Road connected. The Chairman acknowledged that there needed to be a
14 balance. Mark Suennen stated that as part of the balance there would be restrictions on the cul-
15 de-sacs, i.e., underground utilities, no back lots, etc. David Litwinovich stated that by requiring
16 a future right-of-way for cul-de-sacs, homeowners living on the cul-de-sac ran the risk that their
17 cul-de-sac would become a through road.

18 The Chairman stated that it was his objective that positive action be taken on this matter
19 by the end of the year. The Coordinator asked for deadlines to be set. The Chairman asked that
20 the Board be prepared to discuss how the regulations could be modified by the July 23, 2013
21 meeting.

22 Don Duhaime commented that some good ideas came out of the meeting. Christine
23 Quirk agreed with Don Duhaime.

24 The Chairman asked if the Coordinator could schedule the Road Agent for the June 25,
25 2013, meeting to discuss his thoughts on cul-de-sacs. The Coordinator asked for the meeting to
26 begin at 6:30 p.m. instead of 7:00 p.m. in that case. The Board agreed.

27
28 Don Duhaime **MOVED** to adjourn at 9:40 p.m. David Litwinovich seconded the motion
29 and it **PASSED** unanimously.

30
31 Respectfully Submitted,
32 Valerie Diaz, Recording Clerk

Minutes Approved:
07/23/2013