

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON**  
**NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD**  
**November 22, 2016**

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

7 Present for all or part of the meeting were CIP Committee members Fred Hayes, Brandy  
8 Mitroff and Ken Lombard, Road Agent Dick Perusse, Fire Inspector Eric Dubowik, Ken Clinton,  
9 Peter Shellenberger, Selectman Rodney Towne, Nikki O’Neil and Kenny Lehtonen.  
10

11 **Public Hearing on the Capital Improvements Program, Plan of 2017, as proposed by the**  
12 **C.I.P. Committee.**  
13

14 Present in the audience were CIP Committee members Fred Hayes, Brandy Mitroff and  
15 Ken Lombard, Road Agent Dick Perusse, Fire Inspector Eric Dubowik, Selectman Rodney  
16 Towne, Ken Clinton, Peter Shellenberger and Nikki O’Neil.

17 Brandy Mitroff explained that if a Warrant Article for the new Fire Station was placed on  
18 the 2017 ballot and passed, collection for the bond would begin in 2018. She recommended that  
19 the Board view a presentation created by the Fire Department that reviewed the options of  
20 building a new Fire Station and updating the existing Fire Station. She invited the Board to  
21 attend the December 8<sup>th</sup> Finance Committee meeting where the presentation would be given at  
22 6:00 p.m.

23 Brandy Mitroff advised that the Fire Department CRF stayed the same as last year and  
24 the Highway Department truck CRF decreased by \$10K and the heavy equipment CRF  
25 decreased by \$20K.

26 Brandy Mitroff asked for comments and/or questions from the Board. Mark Suennen  
27 referred to the 2019-2020 line on the schedule and noted that \$120K was listed for the Fire  
28 Department vehicle CRF and an additional \$85K was listed for the Fire Department’s SCBA  
29 equipment. Fred Hayes explained that the current CRF was purposed to only collect funds for  
30 Fire Department vehicles. He continued that the CIP Committee had discussed creating a  
31 Warrant Article to rename the CRF “Fire Department Vehicles and Equipment” with the Board  
32 of Selectmen in an effort to combine the two lines and reset the schedule. The Coordinator asked  
33 if the Committee had discussed proposed language for the CRF with the Town Administrator.  
34 Fred Hayes answered no. The Coordinator suggested that Fred Hayes contact the Town  
35 Administrator to remind him that the Warrant Article needed to be drafted. Fred Hayes indicated  
36 that he would contact the Town Administrator.

37 Brandy Mitroff stated that the Town Administrator had brought the GIS mapping project  
38 forward and noted that collection for the CRF could not begin for six years. She believed that  
39 the estimated cost for the project should be placed on the schedule. The Coordinator advised that  
40 the Town Administrator had received an estimate; however, it may not be an accurate amount as  
41 he was looking to get other bids for the project.

42 Brandy Mitroff advised that the Transfer Station had removed a waste management  
43 compost system from the schedule.

44 Brandy Mitroff stated that the NBCS would be placing the proposed addition on the 2017  
45 ballot.  
46

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON  
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD  
November 22, 2016**

**Public Hearing on the Capital Improvements Program, Plan of 2017, as proposed by the  
C.I.P. Committee, Cont.**

Joe Constance commented that he was good with the schedule as it was presented. The Chairman believed that a lot of other people had already crunched the numbers aggressively and therefore, he did not feel the need to do so.

The Chairman asked if the bond for the proposed Fire Station would be voted on at Town Meeting. Brandy Mitroff answered yes.

Mark Suennen noted that the CIP narrative indicated that the NBCS would be providing updated architectural drawings and revised construction cost estimates. He asked if the \$1.29 million listed for the bond was accurate. Fred Hayes answered that the cost estimated had been update three years ago. He noted that the School Board was looking at different expansion options than what had originally been presented, i.e., the possibility of building up instead of off the back and the possibility of utilizing the White Buildings.

The Chairman referred to the CIP narrative and questioned the need to replace oxygen tank units at \$7K each when propane tanks could be recertified. Rodney Towne stated that the cost to replace the tank was about \$1,300 and that it would cost \$7K to replace the entire unit. Rodney Towne stated that the description needed to be rewritten to indicate that the entire unit would be replaced not just the tank.

Mark Suennen thanked the Road Agent for reducing the Highway Department's annual truck CRF from \$100K to \$90K and for decreasing the heavy equipment CRF from \$50K to \$30K.

Mark Suennen asked if the total cost of the proposed construction for an additional bay off the Highway Department building was \$70K. The Road Agent answered that the total cost was \$70K and noted that all the site work would be completed in-house. Mark Suennen asked if permitting for the project would come out of the Highway Department budget. The Road Agent answered yes.

Mark Suennen asked if the salt shed project was being moved out by one year. The Road Agent stated that he was hoping to put the salt shed project on the 2017 ballot. Mark Suennen asked if the \$92K shown on the schedule was an accurate estimate for the project. The Road Agent answered yes.

Joe Constance thanked Fred Hayes for doing all the number work for the schedule. He noted that it took a considerable amount of time and he commented that Fred Hayes did it very well. The Coordinator agreed that Fred Hayes did a great job. She added that the Town of New Boston had a very good committee and CIP program.

The Chairman asked if any members of the Taxpayer Association group attended the CIP meetings. The Coordinator answered yes. Ed Carroll stated that members of the audience were not allowed to speak at the meetings. The Coordinator pointed out that the CIP meetings were public meetings but were not public hearings.

Brandy Mitroff suggested that the Planning Board update the CIP Policy and Procedures Handbook to clarify that public comment was not permitted during the CIP meetings. Joe Constance disagreed with Brandy Mitroff and stated that page 6 of the CIP Policy and Procedures Handbook clearly noted that public comment was not permitted. Brandy Mitroff suggested that the Planning Board consider adding the language, "but there will be no discussion", to the end of the sentence, "The public is welcome."

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON**  
**NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD**  
**November 22, 2016**

1  
2 **Public Hearing on the Capital Improvements Program, Plan of 2017, as proposed by the**  
3 **C.I.P. Committee, Cont.**  
4

5 Mark Suennen asked if not allowing public comment had been an issue during meetings  
6 this year. Brandy Mitroff answered yes. The Planning Coordinator stated that previously this  
7 had never been an issue of contention but this year it had been because members of the Tax  
8 Payers Association had attended the meetings with an understanding that they would be able to  
9 ask questions and had been disappointed when they found out that public comment was not  
10 permitted. The Coordinator pointed out that it had been made very clear during the meetings that  
11 the public hearing was the place to make comments and/or ask questions and that no members  
12 for the Tax Payers Association were present for this public hearing.

13 Brandy Mitroff reiterated her belief that the Planning Board should update the CIP  
14 Policies and Procedures Handbook to note that public comment was not allowed during the  
15 meetings. The Chairman stated that one of the things that Planning Board had been doing was  
16 aggressively reducing pages to documents and not adding to them.

17 The Chairman asked for further questions and/or comments from the audience; there  
18 were no further questions or comments.

19 The Chairman closed the public hearing for Board deliberations.  
20

21 The Chairman **MOVED** to submit the 2017-2022 CIP plan as presented to the Board of  
22 Selectmen and Finance Committee. The motion **PASSED** unanimously.  
23

24 **Informational session with Peter Shellenberger, Ecosmith Recyclers, LLC, re: Minor**  
25 **Subdivision/LLA between Tax Map/Lot # 6/40-1-1 and Tax Map/Lot # 6/40-1.**  
26

27 Present in the audience were Peter Shellenberger, Ken Clinton, Eric Dubowik, Nikki  
28 O'Neil and Road Agent Dick Perusse.

29 Peter Shellenberger, President of Ecosmith Recyclers, noted that Ken Clinton had  
30 appeared before the Board in July to discuss a proposal to complete some earth work in an effort  
31 to create a better parking situation. He continued that since July he had purchased the Byam  
32 house that was located at 7 Byam Road and cleaned up the place. The Chairman asked which  
33 property had been cleaned up. Peter Shellenberger stated that he was working on cleaning the  
34 Byam house and had taken down the double-stacked containers and moved things around at the  
35 Ecosmith Recyclers lot. He continued that he was trying to accommodate the Maas' and had  
36 asked them if they had any objections to the work that was being proposed in July. He stated  
37 that the Maas' did not have any objections but had shared that they were not crazy about looking  
38 at all of the containers. He understood the Maas' feelings; however, he noted that he had been  
39 permitted by the Board to store anything wherever he wanted with the exception of in the rain  
40 garden.

41 Peter Shellenberger stated that he wanted to be a good neighbor and had been excellent  
42 for the community. He stated that he paid taxes and annually gave money to a scholarship  
43 foundation at the school. He noted that of his eight employees, seven of them lived in Town. He  
44 commented that his building was beautiful and that seeing all the bins was beautiful to him. He  
45 understood that not everyone shared that opinion but noted that it was the nature of his business.  
46

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON**  
**NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD**  
**November 22, 2016**

**Informational session with Peter Shellenberger, Ecosmith Recyclers, LLC, re: Minor Subdivision/LLA between Tax Map/Lot # 6/40-1-1 and Tax Map/Lot # 6/40-1, Cont.**

Peter Shellenberger noted that he was before the Board this evening to discuss the possibility of a lot line adjustment between the two properties that he owned on Byam Road. He explained that he wanted to continue an existing berm along Byam Road to completely screen parcel A as shown on the plan and use it for container storage. He explained how he would diagonally park his vehicles so that they could not be seen by the Maas'; he pointed to the location on the plan. He indicated that the only things that would be in the Maas' view would be the side of the existing building and the long trailer that was parked at the property.

Ken Clinton explained that Tax Map/Lot #6/40-1 was currently 2.13 acres in size and Mr. Shellenberger was looking to convey parcel A from Tax Map/Lot # 6-40-1 to the facility property at tax map/lot #6/40-1-1. He continued that parcel B would come from Tax Map/Lot #6/40-1-1 and be placed on the house lot located at Tax Map/Lot #6/40-1. He stated that the parcel A and parcel B were the same size and would therefore create an equal area swap between the two properties.

The Chairman asked for the zoning at Tax Map/Lot #6/40-1-1. Ken Clinton answered that the zoning on the property was spilt; he pointed to the Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District on the property as well as the Commercial "COM" District on the property.

Peter Shellenberger stated that over 100 annual flowers had been planted at the south side of the building last summer as a result of his wife joining a Save the Pollinators group. He stated that his daughter had cut, bundled and sold the flowers for \$5.00 each. He stated that the residents along Wilson Hill Road loved the flowers.

Mark Suennen noted that a part of parcel A, as shown on the plan, would overlap some of the existing driveway. Peter Shellenberger stated that parcel A would not overlap the driveway. Ken Clinton stated that Mr. Byam had used the area in question as an access for his tractor-trailer when he had owned both properties and he advised that the access would no longer be used. He pointed to the driveway that would be used to access the existing house.

Joe Constance asked for the proposed diagonal parking to be explained again; Peter Shellenberger showed how the trucks would be parked on the plan. The Chairman asked how many trucks would be parked on the property. Peter Shellenberger answered that currently he had seven trucks on the property. The Chairman asked for the numbers of trucks permitted at the property. Peter Shellenberger stated that he did not believe that a limitation had been placed on the number of trucks as part of the approval. The Chairman believed that a limitation had been created. Mark Suennen believed that the Board had only created a restriction that three trucks were allowed in the three bays at one time. He continued that he did not believe that the Board had placed a limitation on the number of trucks that could be parked in the parking area.

Ken Clinton stated that Mr. Shellenberger had not expected his business to grow to the degree that it had and had been looking back in July to make some immediate modifications to accommodate his storage needs. He noted that the plan included a potential addition to the existing building for future expansion. He stated that the purchase of the adjacent property created a lot more flexibility with regard to the Maas' view.

Peter Shellenberger stated that he had not been advised of any issues with his property and that the Building Inspector had only discussed a tree that had died along the tree buffer with

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON**  
**NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD**  
**November 22, 2016**

**Informational session with Peter Shellenberger, Ecosmith Recyclers, LLC, re: Minor Subdivision/LLA between Tax Map/Lot # 6/40-1-1 and Tax Map/Lot # 6/40-1, Cont.**

him. He noted that the tree had been replaced and the Building Inspector had sent a letter stating that he was in compliance with what he was allowed to do on the lot.

Ken Clinton stated that Mr. Shellenberger intended on submitting a formal lot line adjustment application as well as a site plan modification request. He explained that they would pursue the previously discussed gravel storage area off the back of the pavement as well as change the type of stormwater management from the bio-retention rain garden to some type of infiltration basin. He stated that though the proposed bin location shown on the plan as parcel A appeared to be located close to the street, it was in fact, the best spot due to the foliage, the existing building and the natural height change with the berm. He stated that the general public as well as the Maas' will be protected from viewing the bins. Mark Suennen recognized that he had been very vocal about the storage of the bins and stated that his primary concern was that the bins could not be seen from Route 13, a/k/a River Road. Peter Shellenberger stated that the bins would no longer be seen from Route 13. Mark Suennen stated that his concerns would be addressed by placing the bins in the location identified as parcel A on the plan.

Mark Suennen stated that should Mr. Shellenberger move forward with a formal lot line adjustment application and site plan modification the Board would be looking to place specific conditions on what would be permitted in the parking area. Peter Shellenberger asked for an explanation of the conditions Mark Suennen had mentioned. Mark Suennen stated that Mr. Shellenberger would not be permitted to stack bins that would be visible from Route 13 and that there would be designated parking areas for the trucks.

Peter Shellenberger believed that he had addressed a lot of the Board's concerns and was moving in the right direction. Mark Suennen agreed that the site had improved since July. He noted that the Board had not put a lot of conditions on the site to allow for flexibility to develop the business; however, he stated that perhaps the Board gave too much flexibility and that flexibility might be tightened up. David Litwinovich stated that the words "tighten" or "restriction" might be bad wording. He commented that he liked that Mr. Shellenberger had been organizing the site. He stated that should a revised plan be submitted he would like to see where bins would be stored in an organized manner. He acknowledged that Mr. Shellenberger's business was growing and believed that having the trucks and bins lined up in an orderly fashion looked better than seeing four trucks parked every which way and a pile of bins.

Peter Shellenberger stated that he would hate to think that the Board would restrict the growth of his business. Mark Suennen commented that Mr. Shellenberger was growing his business and the footprint of his business in a responsible manner.

**Discussion with Fire Inspector, re: Proposed amendments to Subdivision Regulations, Fire Protection Systems.**

Present in the audience was Fire Inspector Eric Dubowik, Nikki O'Neil and Kenny Lehtonen.

Eric Dubowik referred to the proposed amendments to the Subdivision Regulations, IX-J, Fire Protection Cistern Specifications, that he had provided the Board. He noted that the highlighted areas on the handout represented language that met NFPA 1 standards.

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON  
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD  
November 22, 2016**

**Discussion with Fire Inspector, re: Proposed amendments to Subdivision Regulations, Fire Protection Systems, Cont.**

Eric Dubowik referenced section IX-J, Fire Protection Cistern Specifications, A. 3., and noted that the cistern size was being increased to 45K gallons to meet the current code. He further noted that a second option was be adding to the section to allow for the installation of a 15K gallon cistern with an additional, alternative fire protection system approved by the Planning Board. The Chairman asked if the current requirement size for a cistern was 30K gallons. Eric Dubowik answered yes.

Eric Dubowik explained that a lot of fire sources in Town had been destroyed this past year due to the drought. He advised that the Fire Department had been unable to use the Piscataquog River as a water source for a fire along River Road and instead had to rely on Glen Lake in Goffstown as a water source. He indicated that the last cistern installed in Town had been done in 2006. The Chairman commented that cisterns were expensive to install and that was the reason it had been so long since the last installation. He added that increasing the size of the cistern would increase the cost and he believed applicants would not choose to install cisterns. Eric Dubowik stated that there was an option to install a 15K gallon with an alternative fire protection system in lieu of the 45K gallon cistern. The Coordinator pointed out that an applicant would have to offer an alternative fire protection system, i.e., sprinklers, as they could not be required. The Chairman stated that the proposed regulation was an attempt to sneak in a requirement for both sprinklers and cisterns, which was not supposed to happen. Eric Dubowik stated that he was following the NFPA 1 standards that required a fire fighting water source. He continued that the proposed regulation provided an applicant with the option to install a smaller fire cistern as long as an alternative fire fighting system was installed as well. The Coordinator asked for a copy the NFPA 1 standard on this matter; Eric Dubowik indicated that he would provide the Coordinator with the requested material.

Joe Constance asked for the amount of area or dwellings that a 45K gallon cistern covered. Eric Dubowik stated that the current code required that cisterns be located no more than 2,200' from the nearest lot line.

Eric Dubowik referenced section IX-J, Fire Protection Cistern Specifications, A. 18., and explained that the amendment would change the current requirement to schedule inspections 48 in advance to schedule inspections 1 week in advance.

Eric Dubowik referenced section IX-J, Fire Protection Cistern Specifications, B. 14, and indicated that the following language would be added, "Filler pipe [will have an attached 2 ½" National Hose female threaded Siamese or a 4" Storz connector,] it is to be a minimum of 36 inches, and a maximum of 48 inches, above final backfill grade."

Eric Dubowik listed the following proposed recommendations to be added to section IX-J, Fire Protection Cistern Specifications, 2. Products:

- Increase the size of the currently required 30K gallon cistern to a 45K gallon cistern or require a 15K gallon cistern with an alternative fire protection system approved by the Planning Board; with the specifications provided to the Board.
- The Planning Board's authorized cistern inspection agent must be notified at least 1 week before the inspection is required.
- Increase the cistern inspection sheet fee from \$75.00 to \$100.00.

The Coordinator pointed out that the NFPA 1 standard specifically stated that a 15K

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON  
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD  
November 22, 2016**

**Discussion with Fire Inspector, re: Proposed amendments to Subdivision Regulations, Fire Protection Systems, Cont.**

gallon cistern could be installed with accompanying sprinkler systems. She pointed out that the Town could not require that an applicant install a sprinkler system. She noted that the proposal required “an additional fire protection system” and for examples of other fire protection system options other than sprinkler systems. Eric Dubowik answered that another fire protection system could be completely fire protecting a home by covering every piece of combustible material with one-hour rated sheetrock. He also noted that pressurized hydrants could be used as an alternative fire protection system.

Mark Suennen asked if the Fire Department had identified areas of the Town that did not have adequate cistern coverage. Eric Dubowik answered yes. Mark Suennen asked if the information could be shared with the Board so that it could be included in the Master Plan and so that the Board could consider the need and make appropriate decisions when looking at new developments. The Chairman pointed out that the entire Town did not have adequate coverage, as the existing cisterns were not big enough.

The Chairman asked if the Fire Department wanted to require a 15K gallon cistern and sprinklers for every subdivision. Eric Dubowik clarified that the cistern would be required for developments that had five or more houses. The Chairman asked if an applicant for a fifth lot would be required to install a cistern in situation where a property was subdivided one lot at a time, over time. Eric Dubowik did not believe that the situation posed by the Chairman had ever been enforced. The Chairman stated that the 5<sup>th</sup> lot triggered the fire protection system and therefore, the Town would be responsible for 4/5ths of the cost of the cistern because the Town did not require fire protection for the first four houses. He advised that the Board had been given advice from legal counsel that someday someone would build the fifth house and provide the Town with their 1/5<sup>th</sup> portion for the cost of the cistern and the Town would be responsible for the other 4/5ths. Eric Dubowik stated that the requirement was geared toward developments that had twenty houses. The Planning Coordinator pointed out that the regulations currently required a fire cistern for five or more houses and recommended that more discussion occur with regard to the number of homes that would trigger the “additional fire protection”.

Joe Constance commented that the proposed requirements contained too many things that he did not understand and/or troubled him to make a decision at this point. Ed Carroll agreed with Joe Constance and stated that the Board needed to “chew on it” for a little bit.

The Chairman thanked the Fire Inspector for his time and advised that the Board would consider the proposed requirements.

**Continued discussion, re: 2017 Zoning Ordinance changes**

The Coordinator noted that she had not been present at the last meeting but it was her understanding that everyone was happy with the proposed amendments relative to the accessory dwelling units, (ADUs).

The Coordinator stated that the proposed language for the over 55-community regulation had not been finalized at the last meeting and asked the Board if they would have a decision this evening. She explained that if the Board wanted to move forward with the proposed regulation

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON  
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD  
November 22, 2016**

**Continued discussion, re: 2017 Zoning Ordinance changes, Cont.**

she would need to post a public hearing notice before January 5, 2017, which meant she would need to have the first public hearing at the December 13, 2016, meeting.

The Chairman stated that he liked the proposed regulation but did not feel that it needed to be “blasted” in. David Litwinovich did not believe that the Board had worked on the proposed regulation enough to move forward with it at this time.

The Board agreed to work on this regulation further throughout the year. David Litwinovich asked for this proposed regulation to be added to the Planning Board’s 2017 goals.

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF  
NOVEMBER 22, 2016**

6. Discussion, re: Planning Board meetings for the month of December have been scheduled for December 13<sup>th</sup> & December 27<sup>th</sup>. Board to determine whether or not to meet on December 27<sup>th</sup>.

It was the consensus of the Board not to hold a meeting on December 27, 2016.

7. Discussion, re: Rezoning Tax Map/Lot #2/62 from Manufactured Housing Park, “MHP”, with Residential-One, “R-1”, to, for the Board’s discussion.

The Coordinator stated that she needed a consensus from the Board on whether or not to move forward with a Warrant Article to rezone Tax Map/Lot #2/62 from Manufactured Housing Park, “MHP”, with Residential-One, “R-1” building provision to only Residential-One, “R-1”.

The Coordinator explained that the property had originally been zoned as a Manufactured Housing Park, “MHP” and in 2008 Twin Bridge Land Management had petitioned the Town, through a Warrant Article, to add as a permitted use in the MHP District, one-family dwellings without application of manufactured housing restrictions described therein and further to provide that area, density and dimension requirements for one-family dwellings be established as the same as one-family dwellings in the “R-1” District; the Warrant Article passed.

The Coordinator stated that the property had been built out and various property owners had complained to the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer, BI/CEO, regarding horses, barns and livestock within the “MHP”/“R-1” District as agricultural was not allowed in “MHP”. She continued that the BI/CEO had requested that the property be rezoned to an “R-1” District because agriculture was allowed in the “R-1” District and the houses were built to “R-1” District standards.

The Chairman asked if the property should be rezoned Residential-Agricultural “R-A”. The Coordinator answered that the property did not meet “R-A” standards because the lot sizes were too small.

The Chairman asked if neighbors were complaining about other neighbors. The Coordinator answered yes and stated that all the people there had been complaining. The Chairman stated that he would like to have a better understanding of the timing, i.e., a person moved in to the neighborhood next to the barn and then started complaining or did the property owners move into the neighborhood because it was “MHP” with “R-1” and were in favor of the



**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON  
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD  
November 22, 2016**

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF  
NOVEMBER 22, 2016, Cont.**

restriction that animals were prohibited. The Coordinator stated that she would get more information from the BI/CEO.

9. Status update on Bob Waller, Tax Map/Lot #14/80, Home Business Violation

The Chairman asked for an update on the above-captioned matter and if Mr. Waller had been assessed any fines. The Coordinator answered that Mr. Waller had not been assessed any fines. She advised that the BI/CEO had explained that he could not assess fines without a court order. She continued that in the last letter the BI/CEO sent to Mr. Waller he had discussed the possibility of revoking his site plan. She added that the Town Administrator had mentioned that he was going to contact legal counsel regarding the fining process.

The Coordinator stated that the BI/CEO could issue a cease and desist. The Chairman stated that Mr. Waller was not abiding by his site plan and it was his understanding that there were provisions within the Non-Residential Site Plan Review Regulations that allowed for fines to be assessed. The Coordinator stated that the site plan could be revoked during a public hearing.

Joe Constance stated that he would inquire about this matter tomorrow with the Town Administrator.

10. Sign Ordinance update

Mark Suennen asked if Mark Fougere had any information for the Board regarding signs. The Coordinator advised that Mark Fougere had spoken with the BI/CEO and they did not think anything needed to be done right now.

7a. ISWMP approved for San-Ken Homes, LLC, on 11/30/2015, for Tax Map/Lot #2/15-3, Tucker Mill Road, for the Board's review and discussion.

7b. Amended Driveway/ISWMP for San-Ken Homes, LLC, dated 11/17/2016, for Tax Map/Lot #2/15-3, for the Board's review and discussion.

Present in the audience were Nikki O'Neil and Kenny Lehtonen.

Kenny Lehtonen provided revised plans to the Board. He stated that he was proposing to reduce the approved driveway by 280'. He explained that once he had become more familiar with the site it had been determined that there was a better, flatter building envelope. Mark Suennen pointed out that the proposed driveway would only go uphill instead of downhill. Kenny Lehtonen noted that the proposed driveway would be less of an impact.

Mark Suennen noted that more water would flow into the ISWMP and further noted that an engineer had provided a stamped plan that indicated the system could handle the additional flow and keep water off Tucker Mill Road.

It was the consensus of the Board to accept the modified driveway and ISWMP for Tax Map/Lot #2/15-3.

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON  
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD  
November 22, 2016**

1  
2 **Continued discussion, re: Master Plan update**  
3

4 The Board decided to table the Master Plan update discussion to the next meeting on  
5 December 13, 2016.  
6

7 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF**  
8 **NOVEMBER 22, 2016. Cont.**  
9

- 10 1. Approval of the October 11, 2016, meeting minutes with or without changes. (distributed  
11 by email)  
12

13 Mark Suennen **MOVED** to approve the October 11, 2016, meeting minutes as written.  
14 Joe Constance seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.  
15

- 16 2. Distribution of the October 25, 2016, meeting minutes, for approval at the December 13,  
17 2016, meeting, with or without changes. (distributed by email)  
18

19 The Chairman acknowledged receipt of the above-referenced matter; no discussion  
20 occurred.  
21

- 22 3. Endorsement of Acknowledgement of Amendments to the Non-Residential Site Plan  
23 Review Regulations, by the Planning Board Members and Ex-Officio.  
24

25 The above-captioned Acknowledgement of Amendments was endorsed.  
26

- 27 4. Endorsement of Acknowledgement of Amendments to the Subdivision Regulations, by  
28 the Planning Board Members and Ex-Officio.  
29

30 The above-captioned Acknowledgement of Amendments was endorsed.  
31

- 32 5. Letter received on November 14, 2016, from Kathryn Kachavos, to the Board of  
33 Selectmen, re: Tax Map/Lot #8/8 and #8/9, Clark Hill Road, for the Board's review and  
34 discussion.  
35

36 The Coordinator explained that excavation work had started at the above-referenced  
37 property without the property owner obtaining a building permit. She explained that an  
38 application for a building permit triggered the ISWMP. She stated that the property owners had  
39 advised that they did not know about the requirement for an ISWMP. She continued that Glen  
40 Dodge, who was working at the property, eventually came down to speak with the BI/CEO and  
41 he had explained that an ISWMP was required and the process.

42 The Coordinator explained that the Ms. Kachavos was concerned with conservation and  
43 stormwater runoff. She stated that Ms. Kachavos was also concerned that the Town was not  
44 making people aware of requirements. She pointed out that she was not able to monitor purchase  
45 and sales agreements. She noted that it was very rare to have this issue come up.  
46

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON  
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD  
November 22, 2016**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF  
NOVEMBER 22, 2016. Cont.**

Joe Constance reported that he had spoken with the BI/CEO this morning and had been told that a representative from the PLC did not believe that stormwater runoff was not an issue at this moment.

Joe Constance stated he and the Coordinator could follow-up with the BI/CEO tomorrow morning.

Joe Constance referred back the CIP Committee discussion and stated that the CIP Policies and Procedures manual was perfectly clear as it was written. He continued that the manual was a particularly good document and had a very good appendix with history section. He added that the document made it perfectly clear that the public hearing occurred with the Planning Board.

Joe Constance **MOVED** to adjourn at 8:36 p.m. Ed Carroll seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Minutes Approved: 01.24.17

Valerie Diaz, Planning Assistant/Recording Clerk