June 9, 2015

1 The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Planning Board Vice Chairman Mark 2 Suennen. Present were regular members David Litwinovich and Ed Carroll, and ex-officio Joe 3 Constance. Also present were Planning Board Assistant Shannon Silver and Recording Clerk 4 Valerie Diaz. Peter Hogan arrived at the meeting when the Master Plan discussion was taking 5 place.

6

38

7 THE GIRARD FAMILY IRREVOCABLE TRUST

8 **ALLAN D. GIRARD, SR., TRUSTEE** 9 Public Hearing/ Non-Residential Site Plan Review/Home Business/Gift/antique shop 10 Location: 159 Parker Road 11 Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District 12 13 The Vice Chairman read the public hearing notice. He advised the applicant had 14 requested an adjournment of the hearing to June 23, 2015, at 6:30 p.m. 15 The Vice Chairman noted that a floor plan had been submitted. He stated that the final 16 decisions on the driveways and sign design had not been submitted. 17 18 Joe Constance **MOVED** to adjourn the public hearing for a Non-Residential Site Plan 19 Review, Home Business/Gift/antique shop for the Girard Family Irrevocable Trust, Allan 20 D. Girard, Sr., Trustee, to June 23, 2015, at 6:30 p.m. Ed Carroll seconded the motion 21 and it **PASSED** unanimously. 22 23 MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF 24 JUNE 9, 2015. 25

Approval of the May 12, 2015, meeting minutes, with or without changes. (distributed by email)
 28

Joe Constance MOVED to accept the May 12, 2015, meeting minutes as written. Ed
 Carroll seconded the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

- 32 2. Approval of the May 26, 2015, meeting minutes, with or without changes. (distributed by
 33 email)
 34
- David Litwinovich MOVED to accept the May 26, 2015, meeting minutes as written. Ed
 Carroll seconded the motion. AYE Mark Suennen, David Litwinovich and Ed Carroll.
 ABSTAINED Joe Constance. The motion PASSED.
- 4. Copy of Board of Selectmen Consent Agenda, re: appointing Mark Suennen as alternate
 to serve as New Boston Representative to the Southern New Hampshire Planning
 Commission, for the Board's information.
- 4243 The Vice Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion

June 9, 2015

1	MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.				
2					
3	occurre	occurred.			
4 5 6 7 8	5.	Copy of Board of Selectmen Consent Agenda, re: appointing Brent Armstrong as the New Boston Representative to the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission, for the Board's information.			
9		The Vice Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion			
10	occurre	ccurred.			
11					
12 13 14	6.	Copies of 2013, 2014 and 2015, Workforce Housing Purchase and Rent Limits, RSA 674:58–61, for the Board's information.			
15		The Vice Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion			
16	occurre	•			
17					
18 19 20	7.	Construction Service Reports dated May 19, 2015, from Northpoint Engineering, LLC, for Twin Bridge Estates, Phase II, for the Board's information.			
20		The Vice Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion			
21 22 23	occurre				
24 25 26	8.	Construction Service Reports dated May 18, 2015, from Northpoint Engineering, LLC, for Indian Falls/Susan Road Connection - Bussiere, for the Board's information.			
27		The Vice Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion			
28 29	occurre	ccurred.			
30 31 32	9.	Letter copy from Ed Hunter, New Boston Building Inspector, to Joe Foistner, re: 104 Foxberry Drive, Finished Space, for the Board's information.			
33		The Vice Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion			
34 35	occurred.				
36 37 38 39	13.	Invoice dated May 28, 2015, and Construction Services Report dated April 28, 2015, from Kevin M. Leonard, P. E., Northpoint Engineering, LLC, re: Lemay Subdivision/Fieldstone Drive, for the Board's information.			
40 41	occurre	The Vice Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion ed.			
42 43	14.	Invoice dated May 28, 2015, from Kevin M. Leonard, P.E., Northpoint Engineering,			

June 9, 2015

1	MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.			
2				
3		LLC, for Indian Falls/Susan Road Connection - Bussiere, for the Board's information.		
4 5		The Vice Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion		
5 6	00011			
0 7	occurre	occurred.		
8	3a.	Letter copy dated June 2, 2015, from Kevin Leonard, P.E., Northpoint Engineering, to		
9	<i>J</i> u .	Shannon Silver, Planning Board Assistant, re: Twin Bridge Estates - Phase II - Site		
10		Stabilization Onsite Meeting Summary, for the Board's review and discussion.		
11				
12	3b.	Email copy received June 3, 2015, Kevin M. Leonard, P.E., Northpoint Engineering, re:		
13		Twin Bridge Estates - Phase II (Lot Grading & Stump Dump), for the Board's review and		
14		discussion.		
15				
16		The Vice Chairman addressed items 3a and 3b together as they were related.		
17		The Vice Chairman asked for the Planning Board Assistant's overall perspective of the		
18	above-	referenced meeting. The Planning Board Assistant indicated that prior to the meeting a lot		
19	of items had not been completed onsite and that at the time of the meeting a significant number			
20	of those items had been completed. She noted that the remaining outstanding items included silt			
21	fence and moving sand from its current location to the fill area. She added that a discussion with			
22	regard	regard to the pavement and the Road Agent's opinion had taken place.		
23		The Planning Board Assistant advised that the Town Engineer was concerned with the		
24		location of stumps that had been buried. She explained that the Town Engineer was looking to		
25		ard for direction on how to move forward with this issue that could also be used by the		
26	Buildir	ng Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer, (BI/CEO).		
27	L. C.	The Vice Chairman asked for comments and/or questions regarding the onsite meeting.		
28		nstance expressed concern with the stump dump location. He asked how close the lot		
29		be to the stump dump. The Vice Chairman explained that the stump dump was located on ad about d not be located under a bound located with The Vice Chairman		
30 31		nd should not be located under a house. Joe Constance agreed with The Vice Chairman. Instance asked for the size of the lots. The Vice Chairman answered that the lots were 1.5		
32		or slightly less as they were located in an Open Space Subdivision. Joe Constance		
33		oned if the lot could work as a house lot due to the size of the stump dump location and the		
34	-	tee that there will be settling in the area. The Planning Board Assistant stated that it was		
35	0	derstanding that the stumps were buried behind the building sites on the left side. She		
36		ed that when the Board last discussed the stump dump locations they had determined that		
37		ort of documentation needed to be created that identified the exact location of the stump		
38		. The Vice Chairman added that the applicants had buried the stumps without prior		
39		sion and the Board wanted their exact locations identified for the future purchaser of the		
40	-	He continued that the Board wanted to know the number of stumps buried as well as the		
41		and depth of the stump dump.		
42	-	The Vice Chairman stated that because the developer did not follow the plan and		
43	subseq	uently altered it by relocating the stump dump location the Board was requiring that a		

3

June 9, 2015

1 MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

2 3

4

detailed plan be submitted that identified the size and depth of the stump dump. He continued that the plan should be attached to the lot in some way.

5 Joe Constance asked if D&S had buried the stumps. The Vice Chairman answered that 6 D&S had buried the stumps. Joe Constance offered to contact Dave Elliott and view the location 7 tomorrow. The Vice Chairman believed that the issue was bigger than just viewing the location. 8 He reiterated that the developer had created the stump dump without approval of the Board and 9 an engineered plan that showed the stump dump location did not exist. He continued that a 10 potential buyer of the lot(s) would not know by looking at the plan that there were future 11 settlement concerns. The Planning Board Assistant stated that an as-built could be provided for 12 the affected building sites to show where the stump dumps were located in relation to the house 13 sites, septic systems and wells. She added that the as-builts could be required by the BI/CEO 14 prior to the issuance of any COs. The Vice Chairman stated that he was unsure what the Board 15 could require as the plan was approved; however, he believed that something needed to be 16 required.

I7 Joe Constance suggested that the developer dig test pits to determine the location of thestump dumps. David Litwinovich agreed with Joe Constance's suggestion.

The Planning Board Assistant advised that the Town Engineer was concerned that the grading for the lots might not be to plan as it had not been anticipated that the grading would be completed all at once. She noted that the Town Engineer had suggested that he or the BI/CEO complete an inspection with layout provided by the contractor or have the developer submit an as-built. She continued that the Town Engineer believed it would be less costly to the developer to move forward with the inspection rather than the submission of an as-built. The Vice Chairman thought that the choice could be left to the discretion of the developer.

The consensus of the Board was that the developer shall either provide an as-built of the final grading for each lot prior to installation of a foundation or the developer may select to have the Town Engineer complete an inspection of the grades and stabilization prior to the installation of a foundation.

30 31 David Litwinovich MOVED to direct the BI/COE and the Town Engineer to give the 32 developer the option to either provide an as-built with contoured grades and stabilization 33 plan, showing the layout of the lot or have the Town Engineer out to inspect. Joe 34 Constance seconded the motion. Discussion: The Vice Chairman asked if the inspection 35 or the as-built needed to be completed prior to the issuance of the building permit or the 36 issuance of the CO. Joe Constance asked what was common practice with regard to this 37 matter. The Planning Board Assistant believed that the inspection or submission of an 38 as-built needed to be completed prior to the issuance of the CO. She did not believe that 39 the language "prior to the installation of a foundation" was necessary. David Litwinovich 40 **MOVED** to amend his motion to add that either option be completed prior to the 41 issuance of a CO. Joe Constance seconded the amendment and it and the original motion 42 **PASSED** unanimously. 43

4

June 9, 2015

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont. 1

2

14 15

16 17

18

20

- 3 The Vice Chairman referred to the Subdivision Regulations, Section IX-B, 10, As-Built 4 Guidelines and read the following, "As-built plans shall be submitted to the Planning Board, for 5 review by the Town Engineer after all infrastructure improvements have been completed and at 6 least the binder course of pavement has been placed, and prior to the issuance of any Certificates 7 of Occupancy within the subdivision". He understood the section to mean that the as-built was 8 specific to infrastructure and the roadway and not necessarily to lots.
- 9 The Vice Chairman referred to the Subdivision Regulations, Section 10, As-Built 10 Guidelines, 9, e. vii. and advised that the section required a contractor to submit an as-built that 11 included stump dump locations.
- 12 It was the consensus of the Board that the developer submit an as-built that identified the 13 stump dump locations prior to the issuance of COs.
 - Joe Constance MOVED to request that the BI/CEO require the submission of an as-built plan that showed the location of the stump dump locations prior to the issuance of COs. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it PASSED unanimously.
- 19 Continued discussion, re: Master Plan Update, Goals & Objectives
- 21 Ed Carroll advised that he had completed research on best practices for the update of the 22 vision statement. He stated that some towns employed guiding principles and he believed that 23 would fit nicely in New Boston.
- 24 Ed Carroll shared that a lot of the reading he had completed suggested that the Master 25 Plan should be written in the present tense and not the future tense.
- 26 Ed Carroll indicated that he had made some edits to the vision statement that had been 27 distributed and provided those to the Board members. The Vice Chairman commented that he 28 liked the new format. He went on to say that he liked the language change from "...via our 29 guiding principles..." to "...our guiding principles...".
- 30 Ed Carroll noted that he removed the word "protect" from natural resources section and 31 replaced it with "available".
- The Vice Chairman asked for comments and/or questions. Joe Constance referred to #1 32 33 and suggested that the word "the" be removed before the word "growth".
- 34 Joe Constance moved on to #2 and stated that the word "available" was not the 35 appropriate word to be used in the sentence. The Vice Chairman explained that he did not want 36 the word "preserve" to be used as it could create the potential for not allowing people to touch
- 37 natural resources. He continued that not touching natural resources was not a goal of the Town
- 38 or the vision for the Planning Board. He stated that he liked the idea that natural resources
- 39 were important but believed that the word preserved should not be used. Joe Constance
- 40 suggested using the language "managed carefully" in place of "available". Ed Carroll
- 41 suggested removing the language "should be available for everyone's enjoyment". Joe
- 42 Constance did not want to remove the entire subordinate clause. Ed Carroll suggested "Natural
- 43 resources are important for everyone's enjoyment". Joe Constance and The Vice Chairman liked

June 9, 2015

1 MASTER PLAN DISCUSSION, cont.

2

3 Ed Carroll's suggestion. Peter Hogan questioned the use of the language "for everyone's 4 enjoyment". He asked for the purpose of protecting natural resources. Joe Constance answered 5 that the purpose of protecting the natural resources was to preserve the rural character and quality of life in New Boston. Peter Hogan agreed and did not believe the protection of the 6 7 natural resources was for everyone's enjoyment. He suggested "Natural resources are important 8 and should be protected whenever possible". Ed Carroll stated that the word "protected" was 9 objectionable to some members of the Board. The Vice Chairman suggested "Natural resources 10 are important to maintain the rural character of New Boston". The Board agreed with The Vice 11 Chairman's suggestion.

Joe Constance referred to the second sentence of #3 and suggested that "they" be changed to "Town government". He further suggested that the sentence read as follows, "Town government will work to keep our taxes low and assure a high return on our tax dollars". Ed Carroll asked if "Town government" or "Town officials" should be used. Joe Constance answered that "Town officials" should be used. A brief discussion finalized this sentence as "Town officials will work to keep out taxes low and yield a high return on our tax dollars.".

18 Ed Carroll stated that he would make the revisions this evening and email to the 19 Coordinator and Planning Board Assistant.

Joe Constance requested that the semicolon be removed from #5 and be replaced with
 the word "and".

The Vice Chairman asked that "New Boston is our community" replace "New Boston is our home" in the last sentence of the document because the Master Plan was not just for people who lived in town but also for business owners and absentee landowners.

25 The Vice Chairman asked if the Board was comfortable with the edited document 26 moving forward as the 2016 vision for the Town of New Boston. The Board agreed to move 27 forward with the edited version.

The Vice Chairman asked for comments regarding Ed Carroll's proposed article for publication in the New Boston Bulletin. Joe Constance commented that he liked the article. He stated that it was concise and had some "punch". He added that he liked the bullets. David Litwinovich also like the bullets. Peter Hogan commented that the article might spark some interest.

The Vice Chairman asked the Board to review the last meeting's updated goals and objectives to verify that they were consistent with the new vision. Joe Constance suggested that the Board also review goal #1 and goal #2. The Vice Chairman believed that the next step in the update process was to engage the Planning Department to begin research for updating the statistical information of the Master Plan.

38 David Litwinovich advised that he had already gone through the Goals and Objectives 39 and deleted those goals that had either been completed or were no longer applicable based on the 40 survey results. He indicated that the goals highlighted in green needed to be reworded, goals 41 highlighted in blue could be removed or reworded. He distributed copies of his updates to the 42 Board. The Vice Chairman asked that the Board review David Litwinovich's update for

43 discussion at the next meeting.

June 9, 2015

1 2	MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 9, 2015, Cont.			
2 3				
4 5 6	10.	Copy of Planning Board meeting minutes of August 28, 2012, re: Sprinklers & Cisterns, for the Board's review and discussion.		
8 7 8	been p	The Planning Board Assistant explained that the above-referenced meeting minutes had provided to the Board to serve as a reminder of what had been discussed with regard to		
9 10	sprinklers and cisterns in New Boston. She noted at the last meeting the issue of sprinklers had been brought up through an applicant.			
11 12		The Vice Chairman asked for any discussion on this matter. The Chairman asked if the ture had recently done anything with regard to sprinklers. The Vice Chairman answered		
12 13 14	that the current legislature had not dealt with sprinklers in any way.			
15 16 17 18 19	11a.	Email request received June 5, 2015, from Ashley Arbogast, Thibeault Corporation, to Shannon Silver, Planning Board Assistant, re: Conditional Use Permit Application, Tax Map/Lot #6/40-2, request to extend condition subsequent deadline of June 10, 2015, to April 1, 2016, for the Board's action.		
20 21 22	11b.	Copy of Wetlands Permit for Tax Map/Lot #6/40-2, River Road, for the Board's information.		
22 23 24 25	expire	The Vice Chairman addressed items 11a and 11b together as they were related. The Vice Chairman advised that the Wetlands Permit for the above-referenced matter d on May 10, 2016. He stated that extending the CUP conditions subsequent deadline to		
26 27	-	April 1, 2016, would keep it within the current Wetland Permit approval and he noted that the wetland permit would not be extended.		
28 29		The Vice Chairman asked what was left to complete for the project. The Planning Board Assistant advised that nothing had been completed yet.		
30 31	The Vice Chairman noted that three extensions had been granted to date. David Litwinovich did not have a problem extending the deadline as it kept the permit in line with the			
32 33	State's deadline.			
34 35 36 37		Petr Hogan MOVED to extend the conditions subsequent deadline of June 10, 2015, to May 10, 2016, for Thibeault Corporation, Tax Map/Lot #6/40-2. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it PASSED unanimously.		
38 39 40	12.	Email received June 7, 2015, from Kirk Rinker, to Nic Strong, Planning Coordinator, re: 194 Parker Road, Mike Tremblay NRSPR, for the Board's action.		
40 41 42 43	The Vice Chairman advised that Kirk Rinker has wood located on Mike Tremblay's property and was requesting to cut the wood on Mike Tremblay's site. Peter Hogan stated that Mike Tremblay was not allowed to have any employees processing wood for him. The Vice			

June 9, 2015

1 MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

2

MISCELLANEOUS DUSINESS, cont.

Chairman agreed and added that Mike Tremblay would have to deliver Mr. Rinker's wood to
him. Joe Constance, David Litwinovich and Ed Carroll agreed.

5 Peter Hogan stated that the Board could not approve Mr. Rinker to operate on Mike 6 Tremblay's site because he had no standing in the application or approval process. Joe 7 Constance stated that Mr. Rinker could remove his wood from Mike Tremblay's site but he could 8 not cut it onsite because it would violate an agreement previously made. The Planning Board 9 Assistant asked for confirmation that Mr. Rinker could remove his wood from Mike Tremblay's 10 site but that he could not process it to remove it. The Board confirmed the Planning Board 11 Assistant's statement, noting that the only one allowed to process wood on that property was Mike Tremblay. The Vice Chairman believed that the agreement prohibited anyone from 12 13 picking up wood and that any deliveries had to be made by Mike Tremblay off the premises. He 14 asked if the Board was going to make an exception to allow Mr. Rinker to pick up his own 15 personal wood. Peter Hogan agreed to allow Mr. Rinker to pick up his wood in log length if that 16 was what needed to happen. He further noted that if the wood was not Mike Tremblay's wood 17 Mr. Tremblay should have no problem with a grapple truck coming onto the property and 18 loading the wood right back up and hauling it off the site. But he was not allowed to process any 19 wood there. The Vice Chairman stated that his concern was that if, hypothetically, Mr. Rinker 20 took wood that was not his from Mr. Tremblay's property and the Planning Board had apparently 21 given permission for that to happen there could be a problem. He, therefore, stated that he would 22 caveat the approval for Mr. Rinker to remove his unprocessed wood from the property with the 23 requirement that it be with Mike Tremblay's permission. The Board agreed. Peter Hogan stated 24 that it was also a one-shot deal. The Board agreed. 25 26 Joe Constance **MOVED** to adjourn at 8:06 p.m. Ed Carroll seconded the motion and it 27 **PASSED** unanimously.

28

29

30 Respectfully submitted,

- 31 Valerie Diaz, Recording Clerk

Minutes Approved: 07/28/2015