

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

June 23, 2015

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

5
6 Present in the audience for all or part of the meeting were Allan Girard, Dan Donovan,
7 Emile Bussiere, Esq., and Earl Sandford, P.E.

8
9 The Board began with Miscellaneous Business while waiting for Mr. Girard to arrive at
10 the meeting.

11
12 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF**
13 **JUNE 23, 2015.**

- 14
15 1. Distribution of the June 9, 2015, meeting minutes, for approval at the July 28, 2015,
16 meeting, with or without changes. (distributed by email)

17
18 David Litwinovich referred to page 6, line 31 and noted that the word "like" should be
19 deleted and replaced with the word "liked".

20 The Board agreed to approve the meeting minutes at the July 28th meeting as not all of
21 the Board members had read the minutes.

- 22
23 2a. Letter received June 16, 2015, from Daniel Donovan II, to Planning Board, re: NRSPR,
24 Tax Map/Lot #10/3-3, 539 Old Coach Road/request to extend the conditions subsequent
25 deadline of June 25, 2015, to August 1, 2015, for the Board's action.

- 26
27 2b. As-Built Plan, re: NRSPR, Tax Map/Lot #10/3-3, 539 Old Coach Road, for the Board's
28 review and discussion.

29
30 The Chairman addressed items 2a and 2b together as they were related.

31 The Coordinator asked if the applicant was planning on attending the meeting. The
32 Planning Board Assistant answered that she was unsure and noted that it was not necessary for
33 him to be present for the above-referenced request.

34 The Coordinator advised that the As-Built plan had been submitted and contained all of
35 the approved changes. She explained that one of the detention basins had not been built with the
36 depth included on the approved plan and because of that the applicant was in the process of
37 having an engineer certify the basin met the intent of the design.

38 Mark Suennen asked if the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer, (BI/CEO), had
39 been onsite with the plan. The Coordinator answered that the BI/CEO had been to the site on a
40 preliminary basis and noted that he would conduct the compliance inspection in July.

41 The Chairman indicated that he did not have any issue granting the extension.

42
43 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to extend the conditions subsequent deadline of June 25, 2015,

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

June 23, 2015

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

to August 1, 2015, for Daniel Donovan, Tax Map/Lot #10/3-3, 539 Old Coach Road. Joe Constance seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

4. Memorandum dated June 16, 2015, from Nic Strong, Planning Coordinator, to Peter Hogan, Chair, and Planning Board Members, re: Medical Leave, for the Board's information.

The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; there was no discussion.

- 5a. Email, re: NH Supreme Court Case Weighs in on Agritourism, for the Board's information.

- 5b. Copy of NH Supreme Court Case No. 2013-893, Stephen E. Forster D/B/A Forster's Christmas Tree Farm & Gift Shoppe v. Town of Henniker, argued February 19, 2015, opinion issued: June 12, 2015, for the Board's information.

The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; there was no discussion.

6. Email correspondence dated June 10, 2015, between Nic Strong, Planning Coordinator and Kirk Rinker, re: 194 Parker Road, Mike Tremblay, NRSPR, for the Board's information.

The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; there was no discussion.

The Chairman asked if the Coordinator had heard from Allan Girard of the Girard Family Irrevocable Trust, 159 Parker Road, with regard to the proposed parking. The Coordinator answered that the Road Agent believed the second driveway could be built in the proposed location. Mark Suennen stated that he was confused because the Road Agent was not clear where the driveway could be located. He asked if the Road Agent found Mr. Girard's closer than 200' location acceptable. The Coordinator answered yes.

The Chairman asked for the regulations that required the 200' separation between two driveways on the same lot. The Coordinator answered that the 200' requirement was located in the Driveway Regulations. The Chairman asked what entity had the ability to make waive the Driveway Regulations. The Coordinator answered that the Planning Board had the ability to waive the Driveway Regulations.

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

June 23, 2015

Continued discussion, re: Master Plan update, Goals & Objectives

Mark Suennen asked for the purpose of the Coordinator's 6/23/15 memo. The Coordinator stated that the vision statement would be printed in the July issue of the New Boston Bulletin and noted that it was currently available on the Town website. She suggested that the Board take more of an aggressive push with the vision statement as she did not believe printing it in the New Boston Bulletin and positing it on the Town website would generate a lot of input. She suggested that the vision statement be sent to all the Town department managers, boards and commissions as well as business owners and churches in an effort to gather as much input from as many people as possible.

Mark Suennen stated that it was easy for the Planning Department to send the vision statement out to all of the Town department managers, boards and commissions. He asked how the Planning Department would send the vision statement to other Town organizations, clubs, businesses, churches, stores, daycares and garden clubs.

The Coordinator stated that providing the vision statement to the downtown area was easy and noted that she also drove by other business fairly frequently. She explained that the Planning Department did not have a budget for mailing the vision statements. Ed Carroll suggested utilizing an email list to send the vision statement electronically. The Coordinator indicated that Laura Bernard had access to a Town email list and she could ask her to send the vision statement to those on the list. She added that the Planning Department did not have a bulk email list.

Mark Suennen suggested printing the vision statement out on large paper and hanging it on/in the barns at the 4H Fairgrounds during the 4th of July celebration. The Coordinator indicated that she could print out the vision.

Mark Suennen asked if any Planning Board members or Board of Selectmen members objected to handing out the vision to people. Joe Constance stated that the Board of Selectmen would not have problem and the Chairman stated that the Planning Board did not have a problem.

Mark Suennen pointed out that the New Boston Bulletin was delivered to each mailbox in New Boston and that the Board was using that as its direct mailing of the vision statement.

The Coordinator explained that she had rethought the format of the Master Plan in an effort to make it more reader friendly and suggested that following the vision statement four themes be identified. She continued that the current chapters could be spilt under the theme that they fit into and create a much more interesting document using a smaller set of pages.

The Coordinator stated that she would have some statistical information prepared for the August meeting.

The Chairman moved on to the information David Litwinovich had prepared with regard to goals and objectives.

Joe Constance commented that he agreed with most of the items David Litwinovich had recommended be dropped from the Master Plan with exception of a few items. He referenced the section Public Safety Objectives and believed item b. should be retained. David Litwinovich agreed that the item should be retained; however, he felt that it should be re-worded to be more specific.

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

June 23, 2015

1 **MASTER PLAN DISCUSSION, cont.**

2
3 Joe Constance referred to Solid Waste Objectives a. and b. and believed that fee items
4 should be kept reasonable as it currently stated. Ed Carroll asked the Board for their opinions on
5 the number of people that understood "pay as you throw" as listed in the public input survey.
6 Mark Suennen believed very few understood the meaning of "pay as you throw". Ed Carroll
7 wondered if the subject should be re-visited. Joe Constance commented that it was his
8 experience that people did not want "pay as you throw" implemented after he had explained it to
9 them.

10 The Board decided to table the discussion until later in the meeting and/or to another
11 meeting.

12
13 **THE GIRARD FAMILY IRREVOCABLE TRUST**

14 **ALLAN D. GIRARD, SR., TRUSTEE**

15 Public Hearing/ Non-Residential Site Plan Review/Home Business/Gift/antique shop

16 Location: 159 Parker Road

17 Tax Map/Lot #3/115

18 Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District

19
20 Present in the audience was Allan Girard, Dan Donovan, Emile Bussiere and Earl
21 Sandford, PE.

22 The Chairman read the public hearing notice. He asked what the applicant had decided
23 with regard to parking. Allan Girard answered that the proposed driveway would be located 200'
24 from the existing driveway. He noted that the Road Agent had visited the property, however, he
25 had not met with the Road Agent. The Chairman indicated that the Road Agent had no
26 objections to the proposed driveway at only 65' +/- from the existing driveway. He asked if
27 revisions had been made to the plan to reflect the changes to the proposed driveway. Allan
28 Girard answered no.

29 The Chairman stated that he did not believe there was anything adverse about the
30 proposed driveway because it existed at the location of a straight stretch of road.

31 Mark Suennen pointed out that the Board could only permit two parking spaces and as
32 such the plan would need to be revised to reflect those two spaces.

33 Mark Suennen asked if the applicant had decided on the design of his business sign.
34 Allan Girard indicated that he would install a handmade sign that would be located on the shed.
35 Joe Constance asked if the sign would read "antiques". Allan Girard answer that the sign would
36 read "Antiques and More" and would be on an old board to match the rustic character of the area.
37 The Chairman advised that the sign needed to be approved by the BI/CEO.

38 David Litwinovich asked how the parking would be delineated. Allan Girard answered
39 that he was going to place stakes with parking signs attached at the parking area. The Chairman
40 stated that the Board often saw applicants use railroad ties to delineate parking.

41 The Chairman stated that the applicant had to submit, in writing, a waiver request for the
42 200' between two driveways requirement. Allan Girard asked where the waiver needed to be
43 submitted. He was told to bring his waiver request to the Planning Department.

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

June 23, 2015

GIRARD, cont.

The Planning Board Assistant advised that a driveway permit application needed to be completed; she offered to help the applicant with the application.

The Chairman stated that he did not have a problem approving the application conditionally. Joe Constance agreed and added that the approval would be conditioned upon the completion of an approved driveway permit, approved signage and parking delineation shown on the plan. Mark Suennen noted that a waiver for the second driveway with the driveway permit needed to be submitted and he suggested that a deadline for the completion of the conditional items be set for the next meeting, July 28th. He asked if the applicant would be able to have his sign design completed for the next meeting. Allan Girard answered yes.

The Chairman asked what kind of construction was required for the second driveway. The Coordinator answered that the second driveway needed to meet the Driveway Regulations, i.e., pitch away from the roadway, installation of a paved apron, etc.

Mark Suennen asked if the applicant intended on having parking on the grass area and if gravel would be placed down. Allan Girard answered yes. Mark Suennen asked if cars would come off Parker Road, onto the gravel shoulder and park onto the grass. The applicant answered yes. Mark Suennen recommended that the applicant speak with the Road Agent about the proposed driveway to determine what was required to meet the Driveway Regulations. David Litwinovich stated that the Board wanted to see an updated plan that included revisions based on discussions with the Road Agent. Mark Suennen recapped that Mr. Girard had to discuss the second driveway with the Road Agent, submit a driveway permit application and waiver letter for the 200' driveway separation requirement, submit the sign design and submit revised plans by 7/21/15 to the Planning Department.

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to adjourn the public hearing for a Non-Residential Site Plan Review, Home Business/Gift/antique shop for the Girard Family Irrevocable Trust, Allan D. Girard, Sr., Trustee, to July 28, 2015, at 6:30 p.m. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF
JUNE 23, 2015, Cont.**

3. Email copy dated June 17, 2015, from Kevin M. Leonard, P.E., Northpoint Engineering, to Shannon Silver, Planning Board Assistant, re: Indian Falls & Susan Road Connection, request for update, for the Board's review and discussion.
7. Letter dated June 19, 2015, from Emile R. Bussiere, Jr., to Shannon Silver, Planning Board Assistant, re: Indian Falls/Susan Road, design changes. (Emile will be present to discuss).
8. Letter dated June 19, 2015, from Earl J. Sandford. P.E., Sandford Surveying & Engineering, Inc., to New Boston Planning Department, re: Bussiere Subdivision/Indian

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

June 23, 2015

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

Falls & Susan Roads/Plan As-Built Deviations/Compliance Memo, for the Board's review and discussion.

9. Letter received June 23, 2015, from Kevin M. Leonard, P.E., Northpoint Engineering, LLC, to Nic Strong, Planning Coordinator, re: Indian Falls/Susan Road Connection-Bussiere- Response to SSE Letter # 8 above, for the Board's review and discussion.

The Chairman addressed items 3, 7, 8 and 9 together as they were related.

Earl Sandford, P.E., indicated that he had addressed issues relative to the above-referenced matter in a letter dated June 19, 2015. He stated that there were four issues; a dip in Susan Road was higher than designed and three sections of Indian Falls Road that the as-built had indicated were drastically steeper than the required 3:1 slope. He indicated that those slopes had been fixed and were now at 2.8 to 2.9:1.

Earl Sandford, P.E., proposed to the Board that the area of Susan Road that contained the dip not be torn up as he did not see a benefit to it. He stated that the greatest deviation was from the plan was 5".

Earl Sandford, P.E., indicated that there was some confusion with regard to a waiver that had been granted allowing for -3% grade for 75'. He explained that the AASHTO standard was 3% in proximity of the intersection when going uphill. He questioned the reasoning for requiring -3% grade for 75' rather than requiring the AASHTO standard that required the grade not exceed 3%. He added that the drainage worked for the road in its current state.

Emile Bussiere, Esq., referred to an email from the Town Engineer and noted that the Town Engineer had stated that he could not say that there was any kind of functional deviation between what was designed and what was actually built. Mark Suennen asked for the grade going up on the other side of the roadway. Earl Sandford, P.E., answered that the roadway went up at 6.8% and noted that the road had been extended to create more flat area.

Earl Sandford, P.E., provided the Board with a detailed chart that showed the design slope, the As-Built slope and the deviation at 10' stations starting at the intersection. He noted that that 0-10 was located on Indian Falls Road, 10-20 followed the 3% grade according to the design, 20-30 followed the 3% grade according to the design, and 30-40 slightly deviated from the 3% grade.

The Chairman stated that he did not understand how the road was graded wrong. Emile Bussiere, Esq., agreed and stated that he had been paying the Town Engineer to be inspecting the construction. He went on to say that he was upset with Thibeault Corp., Thibeault Corp.'s subcontractors and the Town Engineer for permitting this to happen. He believed that he and Earl Sandford, P.E., had a reasonable solution.

The Chairman stated that the road grade had to be measured before it was paved and therefore, it had to have been known that it was wrong before it got paved. Earl Sandford, P.E., noted that the station at the incorrect grade was at a transition area and it was likely that a stake was knocked out causing the accurate grade to be lost. He noted that during construction the stakes were set at 50' intervals and the 10' interval survey had determined exactly where the error

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

June 23, 2015

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

was.

Mark Suennen asked if the only way to know for sure if the revised layout worked was to see it operate over a winter and spring in order to see how water flowed off Susan Road and onto Indian Falls Road. He continued that verification could be made that there was no ponding on the dip and to ensure that freezing did not occur on the shorter, -3% section. Earl Sandford, P.E., answered no and explained that he had seen dips that went 10' and then went up and they worked. He believed that going 25' at -3% was ample to prevent ponding and freezing. He added that based on physics the water would not travel up the roadway. Earl Sandford, P.E., believed that the applicant had adhered to the spirit of a good intersection design.

The Chairman asked for comments and/or questions from the Board. Joe Constance commented that the proposal seemed acceptable to him.

Mark Suennen referred to the Town Engineer's email and noted that the he had stated that adjusting the roadway to the original design would have no benefit. He continued that the Town Engineer believed that the Board needed to determine if the built condition satisfactorily complied with the waiver issued for the intersection.

Mark Suennen did not believe the discrepancy complied with the original intent of the waiver but it was marginally so. He stated that he was concerned with drainage operations with regard to drainage flowing off Susan Road onto Indian Falls Road. Joe Constance asked if this was more of a wintertime issue. Mark Suennen answered that it was a wintertime and springtime issue. Joe Constance asked how bad the ponding could be during the spring. Mark Suennen answered that he could not say for certain. He believed that there would be less ponding than what would have occurred with the original design due to the construction of the vertical curve.

Mark Suennen suggested that the Board require a one year road maintenance bond in the amount of the cost to reconstruct the area. Earl Sandford, P.E., questioned the science that showed water flowed up hill. Mark Suennen stated that he understood water did not flow uphill and explained that his suggestion was based on the combination of water flow, ponding and freezing that might occur.

Emile Bussiere, Esq., asked if adding more of a crown to the road with the top coat of pavement would help allay Mark Suennen's concerns. Mark Suennen answered maybe and stated that he did not have answer without seeing the drainage counts and how they worked with the revised design. Emile Bussiere, Esq., suggested that the road be built in such a way that sufficient crowns existed following final coat of pavement and require the Town Engineer sign off that there were no drainage concerns rather than tying up money for a longer time than it needed to be tied up. Mark Suennen stated that he did not have a problem with the applicant's suggestions as long as Road Agent and the Town Engineer agreed with Earl Sandford, P.E., and the final grades.

Joe Constance asked for Earl Sandford, P.E., to provide an example of work he had completed recently that was similar to this situation. Earl Sandford, P.E., answered that he completed work similar to this all the time, especially with regard to driveways. He explained that it only had to be carried for 10' with a little, negative pitch as water did not go uphill. He pointed out that the area in question was built at 25' at 3% with a vertical curve. He indicated

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

June 23, 2015

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

1
2
3 that it would take three 24" culverts' worth of water flowing before water ended up on the
4 roadway; he noted this was an extreme amount and it would not happen. Mark Suennen argued
5 that what Earl Sandford, P.E., described was a 25 year storm and could collect within one hour.
6 Earl Sandford, P.E., stated that it was absurd to think that that much water would run
7 longitudinally along the road. He noted that water running down the side had already been
8 fully designed and accommodated through other means to not get onto the roadway. He clarified
9 that he was only addressing water that flowed along the road and not ditch drainage as they were
10 two separate things. He advised that the current grades did not negatively affect drainage.

11 Joe Constance asked if the Chairman had any concerns. The Chairman stated that he was
12 concerned with the roadway being constructed incorrectly and wanted to know how it happened.
13 He believed that Northpoint should put up the money for any concerns about performance for the
14 roadway as the applicant had paid them a significant amount of money to build the road
15 properly. The Coordinator noted that Earl Sandford, P.E., had explained the issue regarding
16 the 50' grade stakes issue and advised that she could provide the reports that documented when it
17 had been found which was a while ago. The Chairman questioned why it had not been fixed
18 when it had been identified. The Coordinator answered that there were a whole host of reasons
19 why things were not fixed at various points in time on this particular project.

20 The Chairman stated that he did not have an issue with the applicant's proposal, however,
21 he did have an issue with roads not being built the way they were engineered. He continued
22 that the Board ended up waiving things that the Road Committee had put a whole lot of time
23 putting together.

24 Joe Constance asked if the "choke point" for Mark Suennen on this matter was extreme
25 conditions. Mark Suennen answered yes and noted that the differential was really small. Joe
26 Constance asked if the marginal difference was enough that Mark Suennen would not feel
27 comfortable moving forward on this matter without the extended bond arrangement. Mark
28 Suennen answered yes. He stated that he would be comfortable if the Town Engineer and Earl
29 Sandford, P.E., could come to an agreement that the drainage calculations were sufficient for the
30 revised layout.

31 The Chairman stated that someone had to do a hard sell on why the regulation should be
32 waived. Mark Suennen asked if the Chairman was suggesting that the roadway be rebuilt. The
33 Chairman did not want the roadway rebuilt as that was obnoxious. He stated that the applicant
34 need to prove that the drainage would work.

35 Earl Sandford, P.E., asked for the regulation that the applicant was violating. The
36 Chairman explained that the Board had originally waived the 75' distance for the -3% grade.
37 Earl Sandford, P.E., pointed out that the regulation stated a maximum -3%. He stated that as an
38 engineer the regulation was confusing and that was why he had written the letter asking for
39 clarification. The Chairman pointed out that any confusion should be addressed during the pre-
40 construction meeting. Earl Sandford, P.E., noted that he had submitted the waiver prior to the
41 design process and the waiver had been granted, however, the waiver was not specific enough
42 for him to understand. He indicated that if the waiver was +/- 3% then it was not needed but if
43 the waiver was -3% it did not make sense. The Chairman stated that the Board had not created

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

June 23, 2015

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, cont.

the regulation but believed it needed to be fixed if it was not readable.

The Coordinator explained that the regulation in effect at the time the waiver was requested required that the road be constructed with a -3% grade to 75' from the center of the intersection. She noted that the regulation had been in effect for a number of years prior to that although she did not know where it originated. The coordinator went on to say that Earl Sandford, PE, found the wording confusing but the Town Engineer had interpreted it the way the Town had meant it; whether it was the same as any other town's regulation or not, it was what New Boston wanted. She further noted that if the regulation was not interpreted that way the waiver would have been unnecessary. The Coordinator then noted that due to the confusion the Planning Board had then amended the regulation to its current wording which clearly stated that the grade for the road had to be -3% 75' from the center of the intersection to the PVC, further reinforcing that the interpretation at the time of the waiver request was correct.

Joe Constance again asked Mark Suennen if he would be comfortable if the Town Engineer and Earl Sandford, P.E., agreed that the existing roadway met all the drainage requirements. Mark Suennen answered yes.

The Chairman asked if the applicant could submit documentation that the Town Engineer agreed with Earl Sandford, P.E., that all the drainage requirements had been met for the existing roadway. Emile Bussiere, Esq., answered yes.

Emile Bussiere, Esq., requested that the Board also ask the Town Engineer to agree that the three identified slopes that were at 2:8 or 2:9 were functionally equivalent of 3:1. The Chairman, Joe Constance, David Litwinovich and Ed Carroll agreed with the request. Mark Suennen abstained from the discussion.

Emile Bussiere, Esq., advised that Continental Paving was scheduled to put down the final coat of pavement during the second week of July. Mark Suennen noted that the deadline for the conditions subsequent was July 1, 2015, and as such a motion was needed to extend the deadline. David Litwinovich asked the length of time that was needed to complete the final coat of pavement. Emile Bussiere, Esq., advised that placing down the final coat of pavement was about a week long project. The Chairman pointed out that the paving would be completed by the Board's next meeting on July 28th and, therefore, a motion was not needed.

The Coordinator stated that if the applicant wanted a compliance hearing on July 28th the Planning Department needed to be made aware 15 days prior to the hearing date. She continued that the Town Engineer would need to have completed his punch list, walk through and sign-off. She noted that the next meeting following the July 28th meeting was August 25th.

The Coordinator stated that the Planning Department needed to know by July 13th if the applicant wanted a compliance hearing on July 28th and that the letter from the Town Engineer needed to be submitted no later than July 17th.

Continued discussion, re: Master Plan update, Goals & Objectives

Joe Constance indicated that he had no issues with any of the changes contained on the first page of David Litwinovich's revised goals and objectives.

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

June 23, 2015

1 MASTER PLAN DISCUSSION, cont.

2
3 The Coordinator asked if Joe Constance had a strong feeling of whether the old vision
4 statement should be removed or remain in the document. Joe Constance stated that he thought
5 the old vision statement had been replaced. The Coordinator explained that the old vision was a
6 vision for the plan and that the new vision was a vision for the community. David Litwinovich
7 believed that the Board had agreed to remove the old vision and replace it with the new vision.
8 Joe Constance agreed with David Litwinovich.

9 Joe Constance asked if the Industrial Development section was being removed in its
10 entirety. The Chairman answered yes as there was only one industrial area in Town. Ed Carroll
11 asked if the Industrial Development would be combined with the Commercial Development
12 section or if it was useless. The Coordinator asked if there was a goal to have more industrial
13 development in the future. Mark Suennen thought that the Industrial Development would be
14 combined with the Commercial Development as follows, "To promote limited small-scale
15 commercial and light industrial development consistent with the Town's needs and desires in
16 keeping with the rural character and ability to provide services". Joe Constance and the
17 Chairman agreed with Mark Suennen's suggestion.

18 Mark Suennen referenced the Commercial Development Objectives and believed that
19 item #'s 1 and 3 needed to be reworded while #2 was appropriate and needed to remain in the
20 document. Joe Constance agreed with Mark Suennen. Mark Suennen suggested that #1 under
21 Industrial Development be integrated into the language of #1 and #3 under the Commercial
22 Development Objectives.

23 Joe Constance referred to the Agricultural section and suggested that item #'s 1, 3 and 5
24 be deleted. He commented that item #'s 2 and 4 seemed broad enough to continue on in
25 perpetuity. Mark Suennen stated that he believed item # 1 should remain and item #2 should be
26 deleted. The Board agreed to delete item #'s 2, 3 and 5 and keep item #'s 1 and 4.

27 Joe Constance referenced the Town Center Goals section and agreed with David
28 Litwinovich's recommendation that item #'s 3 and 4 remain in the document while deleting item
29 #'s 5 -8 Mark Suennen agreed.

30 Joe Constance believed item #1 should be the only item retained under the section
31 Housing Goals. Mark Suennen stated that he would agree if an item #2 could be created with the
32 following language, "To monitor economic trends with respect to housing". Joe Constance
33 agreed with Mark Suennen's suggestion.

34 Joe Constance referenced the Transportation section and agreed that item #'s 1 - 3, 7 and
35 8 should be deleted and item #'s 4 - 6 should remain in the document. Mark Suennen suggested
36 that item #5 read as follows, "to complete, update and maintain the Town's inventory,
37 condition survey and cost analysis for all roads". Joe Constance agreed with Mark Suennen.
38 The Coordinator referenced item #3 and noted that it addressed creating a hierarchy of Town
39 roads. She noted that the Board had been talking about this because the Master Plan used to
40 contain a list of roads that the Town had on a schedule of repair and upgrade. She explained that
41 the list could be used to consider the denial of a subdivision as scattered and premature if an
42 applicant was going to work on a road that was not on the Town's list of improvements and they
43 did not want to put any money toward improving that road. She added that without a list like the

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

June 23, 2015

1 **MASTER PLAN DISCUSSION, cont.**

2

3 one she described the backing for a scattered and premature denial went away. Joe Constance
4 suggested that the information provided by the Coordinator be incorporated into #5; the Board
5 agreed.

6 Joe Constance suggested that the Livable, Walkable Community Goal be removed in its
7 entirety. Mark Suennen suggested that the Board reword item #'s 6 and 10 and place them into
8 the Transportation section. Joe Constance agreed with Mark Suennen.

9 Mark Suennen stated that he had not reviewed David Litwinovich's document beyond
10 this point as he had been on vacation. The Board agreed to table the discussion until another
11 meeting.

12

13 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to adjourn at 8:12 p.m. Joe Constance seconded the motion and
14 it **PASSED** unanimously.

15

16

17 Respectfully submitted,
18 Valerie Diaz, Recording Clerk

Minutes Approved:
07/28/2015