

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

1 The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Planning Board Chairman Peter Hogan.
2 Present were regular members Mark Suennen, David Litwinovich, Ed Carroll and ex-officio Joe
3 Constance. Also present were Planning Coordinator Nic Strong and Recording Clerk Valerie
4 Diaz.

5
6 Present in the audience for all or part of the meeting were Heidi Akerman, Kenneth
7 Lehtonen, Kenny Lehtonen, Tris Gordon, Bob Huettner, Carol Huettner, Attorney Michael
8 Tierney and Dave Elliott.

9
10 **AKERMAN, HEIDI**

11 Public Hearing/Non-Residential Site Plan Review/Kennel

12 Location: 252 Bunker Hill Road

13 Tax/Map Lot # 1/12

14 Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District

15

16 Present in the audience were Heidi Akerman, Kenneth Lehtonen and Kenny Lehtonen.
17 The Chairman read the public hearing notice.

18 Joe Constance asked if the revised plan had been reviewed by the Planning Department.
19 The Coordinator advised that the plan had been reviewed against the checklist; the Coordinator
20 provided copies of the revised plan to the Board members.

21 The Chairman asked if the applicant had found any standards with regard to the
22 recommended number of dogs per caretaker ratio. Heidi Akerman explained that there were no
23 standards with regard to number of dogs/caretaker ratio. She continued that she did not have to
24 follow the standards set forth by NH RSAs because she did not have the number of dogs that
25 required adherence to the standards. She did note that the American Kennel Club recommended
26 that the kennels be large enough for dogs to be able to sit, stand, lie down and turnaround
27 comfortably without any overcrowding. She commented that she could have one-thousand dogs
28 at her property, not that she intended to, and meet those standards.

29 David Litwinovich agreed with the applicant. He advised that he had reviewed
30 guidelines created by the Association of Shelter Veterinarians and the National Animal Care and
31 Control Association with regard to shelter and space. He indicated that the applicant's property
32 met the guidelines he had reviewed. He added that fifteen minutes of care per day had been
33 recommended for each animal.

34 The Chairman noted that there was an outstanding abutter letter fee in the amount of
35 \$8.00. The Coordinator stated that the outstanding fee could be added to the approval
36 conditions.

37 The Chairman asked for comments and/or questions with regard to the revised plan. Joe
38 Constance commented that the plan was clear.

39 Joe Constance asked for confirmation that customers would not be backing their cars out
40 of the applicant's driveway onto Bunker Hill Road and would instead back into a cleared area
41 shown on the plan. Heidi Akerman answered yes. Joe Constance asked if the snow would be
42 removed from the area during the winter. Heidi Akerman answered yes.

43 The Chairman asked for the proposed hours of operation. Heidi Akerman stated that

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

1 **AKERMAN, cont.**

2
3 upon recommendation of the Board she increased her hours of operation to Monday through
4 Sunday, 7:00 a.m. - 7:00 p.m. She added that typically scheduled appointments between 2:00
5 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.

6 Joe Constance asked if the Board should consider other things such as when and for how
7 long the dogs would be allowed to be outside due to the potential for noise issues and so on as
8 had previously been considered for a kennel on River Road. The Chairman indicated that the
9 other kennel had houses in close proximity and he was not as concerned with the noise issues for
10 this application because of the location of the property. He added that he wanted to address
11 continuous barking. He asked for the findings of Joe Constance and Mark Suennen's noise
12 measurements. Joe Constance stated that he had listened for noise from Poor Farm Road and
13 could not hear any dogs barking. He continued that Mark Suennen had listened for noise from
14 Saunders Hill Road. Mark Suennen commented that the barking he heard was softer than the
15 wind he could hear blowing through the trees. He added that he could hear the applicant and she
16 was louder than the dogs. He did not believe that noise from the dogs would have an impact on
17 the neighborhood.

18 The Chairman asked if the applicant had plans to install a sign for her business. Heidi
19 Akerman answered that she did not intend to install a sign and stated that she would mark her
20 house number, 252, on her mailbox. The Chairman noted that signs reduced the number of
21 people wandering aimlessly around the neighborhood looking for the business. Heidi Akerman
22 stated that her property contained a lot of landmarks, i.e., a large barn and silo.

23 The Board agreed that increased traffic was not an issue with this application.

24 Ed Carroll asked if the parking area would have lighting. Heidi Akerman pointed to a
25 motion sensor light that was installed on the side of the house that would light the parking area.
26 She noted that the light was very bright and lit a large area.

27 The Chairman asked the applicant to fill out a driveway permit for the Town's file. He
28 explained that the Board had been requesting this of older properties in Town and noted that the
29 fee for the permit would be waived.

30 The Chairman asked the applicant to discuss the septic system that would be used as well
31 as address water usage for the business. Heidi Akerman identified the location of the septic
32 system, well and outbuildings. She stated that she would be required to obtain a permit if she
33 used over 20K gallons of water per day. She did not anticipate using over 20K gallons of water
34 per day as the dogs only required 50 gallons of water per day.

35 The Chairman asked if the applicant was proposing any new landscaping. Heidi
36 Akerman answered no and explained that the landscaping where customers would be consisted
37 of sparse grass and gravel. Mark Suennen stated that the landscaping was sufficient.

38 The Chairman commented that he did not believe there were any floodplain issues.

39 The Chairman pointed out that the Planning Board did not determine the suitability of
40 care for the dogs and only determined the suitability of the property for the proposed business.
41 He continued that the applicant would have to follow the guidelines of the agency that regulated
42 the care of animals. Heidi Akerman stated that she went over and above the care required by the
43 State.

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

1 **AKERMAN, cont.**
2

3 The Chairman noted that the applicant had listed herself as the sole employee of the
4 business. Heidi Akerman stated that she was the sole proprietor and did not want to hire any
5 employees. She indicated that she would hire a temp service, family or friends to watch her dogs
6 if she needed to travel to pick-up other dogs. The Chairman indicated that those listed could be
7 construed as employees. Heidi Akerman explained that someone could earn up to \$600.00
8 without having to file a 1099 tax form. Mark Suennen asked for confirmation that anyone hired
9 to help with the dogs would be paid less than \$600.00 per year. Heidi Akerman answered that
10 the person would be paid much less than \$600 should she need to hire someone to casually
11 babysit the dogs.

12 The Chairman asked what the applicant would do if she became injured or ill and could
13 not care for the dogs for a long period of time. Heidi Akerman answered that she would hire a
14 temp service to care for the dogs. The Chairman suggested that the applicant remove the note
15 from the plan that stated she would have no employees in the event that she needed to hire an
16 employee. The Coordinator pointed out that the Minor Site Plan Review Regulations allowed
17 for no more than one non-family, onsite employee. The applicant agreed to replace her note
18 regarding no employees with the language provided by the Coordinator.

19 The Chairman acknowledged that the Town did not have a noise ordinance; however, he
20 commented that non-stop dog barking was not okay. David Litwinovich questioned if "non-stop"
21 dog barking could be quantified by making a condition that prohibited continuous barking for
22 more than one hour. He noted that if the non-stop barking was not quantified it could not be
23 enforced. The Board agreed to quantify the non-stop barking by prohibiting continuous dog
24 barking for more than one hour.

25
26 David Litwinovich **MOVED** to approve the site plan for Heidi Akerman to operate a
27 kennel from her property at 252 Bunker Hill Road, Tax Map/Lot #1/12, subject to the
28 following conditions:

29
30 **CONDITIONS PRECEDENT:**

- 31 1. Submission of a minimum of four (4) revised site plans that include all of the
32 checklist corrections and any corrections as noted at this hearing.
33 2. Submission of a Driveway Permit Application for town records at no cost to the
34 applicant.
35 3. Execution of a Site Review Agreement.
36 4. Payment of any outstanding fees for the site plan application.

37 The deadline for complying with the condition(s) precedent shall be **December 27, 2015**,
38 the confirmation of which shall be an administrative act, not requiring further action by
39 the Board. Should compliance not be confirmed by the deadline date, and a written
40 request for extension is not submitted prior to that date, the applicant is hereby put on
41 notice that the Planning Board may convene a hearing under RSA 676:4-a to revoke the
42 approval.
43

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

1 **AKERMAN, cont.**

2
3 **ONGOING CONDITIONS:**

- 4 1. No more than one (1) non-family, on site employee will be employed.
5 2. The hours of operation are 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday thru Sunday by appointment
6 3. One hour of dog barking is prohibited.
7 4. Two parking spaces are permitted.
8 5. The parking area shall be arranged so that cars will not back out onto Bunker Hill
9 Road.
10 6. No sign is proposed at this time. Any future plans for the installation of a sign
11 shall follow the permitting procedures in place at the time of application.
12 7. The kennel shall be operated within the areas of the existing dwelling designated
13 on the approved plan.
14 8. Exterior storage of materials or variation from the residential character of the
15 principal or accessory structure shall not be permitted.
16 9. Any proposed changes to the type of business or any other conditions shown on
17 the approved plan shall be submitted to the Planning Board for a determination of
18 the need for any further site plan review prior to instituting any such changes.

19
20 Joe Constance seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

21
22 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF**
23 **OCTOBER 27, 2015.**

- 24
25 3. Driveway Permit Applications for SKRE Holdings, LLC, Tax Map/Lot #'s 2/15-2 & 3
26 (shared), #2/15-4 and #2/15-5, Tucker Mill Road, for the Board's action.

27
28 Present in the audience were Kenneth Lehtonen and Kenny Lehtonen.

29 Mark Suennen asked if the Road Agent had reviewed the above-referenced driveway
30 permits. The Coordinator answered yes and added that the Road Agent had signed-off on the
31 permits.

32 Mark Suennen asked if the Road Agent had created any conditions for the permits. The
33 Coordinator advised that the Road Agent required 15" culverts and required that the driveway
34 plan be referenced.

35
36 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to approve the Driveway Permits for Tax Map/Lot #'s 2/15-2 &
37 3 (shared), #2/15-4 and #2/15-5, Tucker Mill Road, for SKRE Holdings, LLC. David
38 Litwinovich seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

- 39
40 7. Letter received October 23, 2015, from Kenneth Lehtonen, San-Ken Homes, Inc., to
41 New Boston Planning Board, re: extension to the conditions precedent date of November
42 8, 2015, for the Board's action.
43

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

1 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.**

2
3 Present in the audience were Kenneth Lehtonen and Kenny Lehtonen.

4 The Coordinator explained that the deadline for the completion of conditions precedent
5 was November 8, 2015, which was two days prior to the Board's scheduled meeting of
6 November 10, 2015. She noted that she had just received revised plans and legal documents that
7 needed to be reviewed by Town Counsel and as such the Board could not sign any of the
8 required documents tonight.

9 Mark Suennen asked for the date that the applicant wished to extend the deadline. Kenny
10 Lehtonen stated that he did not want to extend the deadline to the next meeting and was hoping
11 that everything could be reviewed at this meeting so that the mylar could be signed and that
12 Town Counsel's comments could be addressed at a later time. He indicated that he had
13 homebuyers that wanted to be in their new homes by Christmas and that waiting two more weeks
14 to get started would make that impossible.

15 Joe Constance asked for a description of the material that was being reviewed by Town
16 Counsel. Kenny Lehtonen advised that deed easement language for the common driveway, the
17 no-cut area long Peacock Brook and the stump dump locations were being reviewed.

18 Mark Suennen asked if the applicant's concern was getting the mylar signed by the Board
19 before November 10, 2015. Kenny Lehtonen answered yes and explained that the mylar needed
20 to be signed before he could obtain building permits. Mark Suennen advised that if the mylar
21 was not ready to be signed at the meeting of November 10, 2015, the next time the Board could
22 sign it would be at the November 24, 2015, meeting. Kenny Lehtonen stated that he was told
23 that mylar could be signed in between meetings. The Coordinator clarified that she had advised
24 the applicant that it might be possible for the Chairman and Secretary to sign the mylar on a
25 Wednesday evening when the Town Clerk's office was open late if they were available, however,
26 she noted that she could not make that promise to anyone.

27 Kenny Lehtonen asked if there were any other items that needed to be completed besides
28 signing the mylar. The Coordinator stated that the Notice of Decision that was mailed to the
29 applicant listed all the conditions that needed to be completed.

30 Ed Carroll asked if the mylar could be signed on a conditional basis. Mark Suennen
31 answered no.

32 Kenny Lehtonen asked how long it typically took Town Counsel to review documents
33 and make comments. Mark Suennen answered that the response time varied and stated that the
34 applicant's attorney was welcome to contact Town Counsel to suggest that the matter be
35 expedited.

36
37 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to extend the conditions precedent deadline for San-Ken Homes
38 from November 8, 2015, to November 27, 2015. Joe Constance seconded the motion and
39 it **PASSED** unanimously.

- 40
41 1. Approval of the September 22, 2015, meeting minutes, with or without changes.

42
43 David Litwinovich **MOVED** to approve the September 22, 2015, meeting minutes as

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

1 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.**

2
3 written. Joe Constance seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

- 4
5 2. Distribution of the October 13, 2015, meeting minutes, for approval at the November 10,
6 2015, meeting, with or without changes.

7
8 The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion
9 occurred.

- 10
11 4. Copies of updated November 2015 - December 2016 calendars.

12
13 The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion
14 occurred.

- 15
16 5. Letter dated October 15, 2015, from Shannon Silver, Planning Board Assistant to George
17 Merrill, C&G Ledges, re: Conditions Subsequent deadline of November 1, 2015, for Tax
18 Map/Lot #3/63-13, Whipplewill Road, of the Board's information.

19
20 The Coordinator advised that she had not heard back from George Merrill regarding the
21 extension. She explained that there was one phase left to be completed of this storage unit
22 business, however, Mr. Merrill had not shown any intention of completing it in the near future.
23 She noted that Phase II had been approved and was on the plan and that there were no vesting
24 issues as Mr. Merrill had shown substantial completion of improvements.

25 Mark Suennen asked what was left to be completed. The Coordinator answered that
26 there were two buildings left to be built and showed the plan to the Board. A brief discussion
27 took place about not granting the extension as the conditions placed on the plan had not been
28 fulfilled. The Chairman noted that all the site work was completed a long time ago and the site
29 was stabilized. He did not have a problem letting the plan continue and extending the deadline.

30
31 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to extend the conditions subsequent deadline of November 1,
32 2015, to November 1, 2017. Joe Constance seconded the motion and it **PASSED**
33 unanimously.

- 34
35 8. Discussion with Twin Bridge Land Management, re: road completion, bulk lot
36 excavation and lot development.

37
38 Present in the audience were Tris Gordon, Bob Huettner, Carol Huettner, Attorney
39 Michael Tierney and Dave Elliott.

40 Michael Tierney, Esq., advised that the applicants were looking to have Wright Drive
41 accepted by the Town and noted that it had been constructed one year ago. He stated that the
42 Town Engineer had suggested that the applicants meet with the Board to discuss any items that
43 needed to be completed.

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

Mark Suennen stated that the Road Agent had requested that the final coat of pavement be placed on the roadway prior to the Town accepting the road. He noted that discussion had taken place regarding the movement of material over the roadway after it was accepted. He asked if the applicants had the opinion from the Road Agent. Tris Gordon answered that he had received a letter from the Road Agent that stated the Road Agent's preference that the final coat of pavement be placed on the roadway.

Tris Gordon informed the Board that most of the material on one side of the subdivision had been removed and he believed that this project was not unlike any other project in New Boston. He explained that other subdivisions hauled most of the material they used onsite into the subdivision and he pointed out that his subdivision did not require him to haul any material onto the sites.

Dave Elliott stated that the Road Agent wanted substantial completion of moving material from the cut-side of the road to the fill-side of the road and that it was at that stage now. He went on to say that the road stood the same as any other road with a top coat and that some subdivisions required thousands of yards of material to be brought onto the site for development and this subdivision did not require that material be brought onto the site.

Mark Suennen asked when the applicant believed all the lots would be sold and developed based on the current rate that the houses were being sold and developed. Tris Gordon commented that the time frame for developing varied as some years had been good and others bad. He stated that on average they had been selling three to four homes per year. He commented that there were currently thirteen or fourteen taxpayers that lived along Wright Drive that wanted to receive mail and have the road maintained by the Town. He stated that it had taken about three years to complete half of the subdivision and would most likely take an additional two to three years to complete the subdivision.

Joe Constance asked for someone to refresh his memory regarding a discussion about who would be responsible for damage to Wright Drive after the final top coat of pavement was placed down and materials were hauled over it. The Chairman stated that the subdivision owner/developer and or contractors hauling equipment on the road were always responsible for any damage depending on who did the damage. The Coordinator noted that the two-year maintenance bond only covered defects in workmanship.

Mark Suennen asked for an estimated timeframe to complete the final top coat this year. Dave Elliott indicated that timeframe was hard to judge as it was based on the temperature but he estimated that the paving could be completed within the next two weeks.

The Chairman asked if the maintenance bond would cover the berm that would not make it through the winter. Mark Suennen stated that he was going to leave the determination of whether the berm was considered part of the road maintenance bond to the Road Agent. The Chairman questioned whether the cost to repair the berm would come out of the Road Agent's pay or if the taxpayers would be charged for the repairs. Joe Constance stated that the Road Agent was satisfied with the berm. Mark Suennen noted that the Chairman disagreed with the Road Agent on this matter. The Chairman commented that the Road Agent was wrong with regard to the berm.

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

Mark Suennen asked what the applicants were seeking from the Board at this meeting. Bob Huettner indicated that they were present in response to the Town Engineer's letter and to ensure that the Board was happy with the road as they were looking to get it accepted.

Dave Elliott stated that the Town Engineer had expressed concern with offsite grading which had nothing to do with moving earth or curbing issues. He believed that the Town Engineer wanted to know how finished lot grading would be managed by the Town. He explained that there was an unusual amount of excavation and fill to be completed on the lots and that the design included drainage to address those matters. He did not believe this was related to the road and suggested that the Building Department handle this matter by not issuing COs until the site was shaped the way it was designed and approved to be shaped. Bob Huettner added that Dave Elliott's suggestion should be addressed on a lot by lot basis.

Tris Gordon stated that they were being "double charged" and explained that they were required to have their engineers complete a plan that showed grades prior to the issuance of COs at a cost of \$2,800. He continued that at the same time they were paying the Town to have the Town Engineer complete the same job. Mark Suennen stated that it was the applicant's responsibility to develop all of the drainage required on the plans and the fact that they were choosing to do so lot by lot was not the Planning Board's problem. He further stated that the fact that the applicants had to pay their engineer to show that the interim condition of an incomplete drainage system to ensure that it would meet the requirements of the overall plan was on the applicants because they had chosen to develop the subdivision lot by lot. He commented that he understood the financial reasons for choosing to develop the subdivision lot by lot, however, he pointed out that it was the choice of the applicants to proceed that way. He indicated that the Board would prefer that the entire drainage system be completed prior to the sale of any of the lots but also understood that it was not practical or feasible. Tris Gordon stated that they could not complete the entire drainage system at once as they were only allowed to open up five acres at one time. Mark Suennen reiterated that the Board understood that completing the entire drainage system at once was not feasible and was the reason the Board accommodated the applicants by allowing them to develop and submit interim approvals for the drainage on a lot by lot basis.

Mark Suennen asked if the applicants were requesting that the Board separate the consideration of the individual lot drainage issues from the roadway and allow for the roadway to be paved and accepted so that the lots could be developed as they normally would be developed. Tris Gordon answered yes. Mark Suennen commented that he could follow and accept that logic with the understanding that either the entire drainage system be completed or that the applicants continued to develop the interim drainage system keeping in mind that the roadway elevation would be at top coat.

Dave Elliott stated that this subdivision was not unlike many lots in New Boston that he had worked on that required engineering because of driveway grades. He continued that the difference between this subdivision and other subdivisions in Town was that the Town Engineer was constantly overseeing and commenting on items that had been completed but he did not certify whether items were in compliance. Mark Suennen stated that it was the job of the Town

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

1 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.**
2

3 Engineer to certify that the drainage being installed was built to the approved plan. He reiterated
4 that the applicant had the opportunity to build out the entire drainage system, five acres at time,
5 before any of the lots were sold. He continued that the Board had been accommodating and
6 allowed the applicants to build the drainage on a lot by lot basis. He explained that the Town
7 Engineer could not certify that the interim drainage plans met the final approved plan because
8 the final system was not yet built. He stated that when the drainage system was completed the
9 Town Engineer would certify that it met the approved plan. He noted that the Board had asked
10 the Town Engineer to review the interim proposal as they went along. He pointed out that this
11 was the cost of doing business the way the applicants were choosing to do business. Tris Gordon
12 stated that they understood that everyone needed to make a buck but they believed that they
13 needed to make a buck too. He commented that it was impossible to complete all the drainage at
14 once.
15

16 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to permit Twin Bridge Land Management to proceed to lay the
17 top coat of pavement for Wright Driveway and request Town acceptance for the roadway
18 by the Board of Selectmen. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it **PASSED**
19 unanimously.
20

21 **Discussion, re: proposed Zoning Ordinance and/or Building Code Amendments for 2016**
22

23 The Coordinator advised that the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer, (BI/
24 CEO), was currently working on proposed Zoning Ordinance and Building Code amendments.
25 She advised that there could potentially be amendments for alarms and carbon dioxide detectors
26 for the Building Code. Mark Suennen asked if the amendment was required by the State. The
27 Coordinator answered that one of the amendments was over and above the State requirement.
28

29 The Coordinator stated that she had kept notes on possible amendments that had been
30 addressed by the Board over the last year. She noted that it had been discussed to add the
31 definition of "Accessory Dwelling Unit" into the general definitions section of the Zoning
32 Ordinance.

33 The Coordinator explained that the BI/CEO was working on an amendment to address
34 confusing language with regard to front yard setbacks for lots in open space subdivisions. She
35 referred to a table on page 66 of the Zoning Ordinance and pointed out that it listed "front yard
36 30 feet", however, the note that was referenced stated that following, "The average depth of all
37 front yards within an open space development shall not be less than 30 feet; however, no front
38 yard of any lot shall be less than 24 feet".

39 The Coordinator advised that the BI/CEO had a question from an applicant that was
40 proposing to build a shed that would be located in the front yard setback between 24 feet and 30
41 feet. She explained that it had been very confusing to determine if the shed could be built in the
42 proposed location. She indicated that the BI/CEO was going to propose that the setback be
43 written as 30 feet.

The Coordinator indicated that the BI/CEO was looking into creating an amendment to

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

ZONING AMENDMENTS, cont.

allow a non-conforming residential use to build an addition into the setback without the need for a variance.

The Coordinator stated that a proposed amendment would address adding "fuel wood processing yard" to the Industrial District. She noted that the Industrial District currently allowed the use "saw mill" as a permitted use and this would not be much different.

The Coordinator stated that the BI/CEO wanted to add an "attached accessory dwelling unit" definition and description into the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that this was also known as an "in-law" apartment and currently in New Boston both "in-law" apartments and full blown duplexes were classified as two-family dwellings. She explained that the BI/CEO had received questions from banks with regard to homes being considered duplexes or in-law apartments as there were separate financial options for both. She noted that there was a difference to the BI/CEO as well with regard to access to electrical panels and other utility items.

The Coordinator stated that the proposal should be ready for discussion with the BI/CEO at the next meeting.

Continued discussion, re: Master Plan Update, Goals and Objectives.

David Litwinovich referred to the draft of the Master Plan Update Goals and Objectives, Community Facilities Guidelines and recommended that item #1 be removed as it was a matter course. Mark Suennen and Joe Constance agreed with David Litwinovich.

David Litwinovich believed that item #2 should remain under guidelines. Joe Constance agreed that item #2 should remain and be renumbered as item #1.

Joe Constance commented that the actions and guidelines that listed under Objectives Related to Specific Community Facilities and Services stated the obvious. David Litwinovich agreed with Joe Constance and suggested that all the actions and guidelines be removed from the section. The Board agreed.

Joe Constance stated that he would craft one or two sentences that would encompass a town government goal and make them item #2 under Community Facilities Guidelines.

Joe Constance referred to the Forest Resource Objectives and commented that he liked the suggestion highlighted in red as he had seen two examples in Town where property owners had not been considerate of buffer zones. Mark Suennen asked if Joe Constance liked the wording "consider buffer zones". Joe Constance answered that he did not necessarily like the wording but he noted that he liked the idea it suggested. Ed Carroll suggested the language, "To encourage buffer zones". Joe Constance liked Ed Carroll's suggestion. Mark Suennen suggested the following, "To encourage buffer zones along lot lines". The Board agreed with the suggestion.

Joe Constance summarized that item #1 under Forest Resource Objectives would become a guideline and "To encourage buffer zones along lot lines" would become an action.

Mark Suennen asked if an energy goal needed to be created. The Chairman answered no. Mark Suennen and Joe Constance agreed with the Chairman.

Ed Carroll moved on to the suggestion that the Board consider adding Regional Goal

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of 2015**

October 27, 2015

1 **MASTER PLAN, cont.**
2

3 Objectives. Mark Suennen asked if the suggestion had come from the Master Plan Survey. The
4 Coordinator answered no and advised that she had added this item for consideration. She
5 explained that towns were being encouraged not to think of their towns in isolation and to be
6 cognizant of what abutting communities were doing relative to zoning and goals, specifically, in
7 those areas that adjoined your town. She continued that it was important to consider adjoining
8 zones to avoid potential conflicts. She noted that there were also opportunities for joint
9 purchasing, cost sharing and consultant sharing between neighboring communities.

10 Mark Suennen suggested the following language for the Regional Guideline, "To
11 consider opportunities for joint planning with neighboring towns".

12 The Coordinator indicated that it would be helpful for her while reviewing statistical
13 information to know what format the Board would be moving forward with for the Master Plan,
14 i.e., continue with separate chapters or creating overall themes. The Board was in favor of broad
15 themes for the overall look of the Town. She referred to a proposed format that she had provided
16 on June 23, 2015, and asked if the following themes would work, 1) rural character and quality
17 of life, 2) people, history, heritage and culture, 3) managing growth and development and 4)
18 community services and facilities. Mark Suennen suggested using the themes listed with the
19 exception of 4) community services and facilities as it was a not a major characteristic of the
20 Master Plan.

21 The Coordinator referenced a memo to the Board dated August 25, 2015, pages 3 and 4,
22 and pointed to the red highlighted text. She indicated that the highlighted language had been
23 provided as suggestions for the Master Plan vision statement. She asked the Board to review and
24 determine whether they wanted to utilize the suggestions.

25 Mark Suennen commented that he liked the additional language proposed in item #1 and
26 that he was not in favor of the additional language in item #2.

27 The Board disagreed and ultimately did not add any of the additional language to the
28 vision statement.

29 Mark Suennen offered to write the next article for the New Boston Bulletin. The
30 Coordinator suggested that the article advise that the first draft of the Master Plan Goals and
31 Objectives had been completed and was available for viewing.
32

33 Joe Constance **MOVED** to adjourn at 8:34 p.m. Mark Suennen seconded the motion and
34 it **PASSED** unanimously.
35
36
37
38

39 Respectfully submitted,
40 Valerie Diaz, Recording Clerk

Minutes Approved:
11.24.15