

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON PLANNING BOARD
December 13, 2016**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Planning Board member Mark Suennen.

Present for all or part of the meeting were Chairman Peter Hogan, regular members Mark Suennen, David Litwinovich and Ed Carroll, and ex-officio Rodney Towne. Also present was Planning Consultant Mark Fougere, Planning Coordinator Shannon Silver, Planning Assistant/Recording Clerk Valerie Diaz and Building Inspector Ed Hunter.

Present for all or part of the meeting were Michael DePetrillo, Karen Lewis, Nicholas Isaia and Laura Dallman.

Public Hearing On Proposed Zoning Ordinance

The Coordinator recommended this be tabled as definitions need to be redefined to separate sections or another way. The definition has been added to 404.2, there are two definitions for attached and detached.

Mark Fougere introduced and discussed this item saying the purpose of the change is the state changed the statute last year relative to accessory dwelling units (ADU), that they can't be prohibited but also giving specific criteria that has to be complied with. Two minor changes have to be made. One is to change the definition of an ADU to reference the state statute. The other is if the ADU is attached to the principal dwelling unit (PDU) there has to be a door between the two units to make it accessible. The amendments are straightforward but not ready for Board review. He is going to work on this. The changes don't change what is currently allowed.

The Coordinator reviewed the changes:

- authority and purpose 404.1 adding RSA reference
- 404.2 the new state definition of ADU, but it doesn't work for New Boston because detached is allowed so need to make sure that is referenced.
- 404.3 #16 Requirements and Limitations: Add interior door segment to the requirements. This will be different pieces built into one amendment.
- Rodney Towne commented #3 and #9 of the existing ordinance conflict with each other. The Coordinator explained the owner has to occupy one of the units. #9 can't call an ADU the PDU but the owner could move into the ADU and rent the PDU and the PDU would still be called the owner's PDU. When the ADU is built there are requirements such as size. Mark Fougere explained ADU means size "less than" or "accessory to" the PDU.

Public Hearing On Proposed Zoning Ordinance cont.

Rodney Towne asked if that serves the intent and purpose of what the town is trying to do. He was concerned it might force someone with an ADU to move when it is time to downsize if they can't move out of and rent the PDU.

The Coordinator explained the intent was about workforce housing, reasonable rent and a way for people to make extra money on their property. The intent is probably not for a person to own both dwellings but not be able to rent the PDU and move into the ADU or the other way around that is irrelevant.

Mark Fougere commented the important thing is to require the owner to live there.

The Coordinator commented detached ADUs cannot be converted to PDU, meaning they can't be taken out of the restrictions they were built under (such as square footage) and it is interpreted this way by the Building Inspector and applicants.

Rodney Towne was concerned the Board needs to understand and the Board's intent needs to be duly noted, clear and well documented.

Mark Suennen commented #3 references who has to live where and #9 references the designation of the two buildings.

Rodney Towne was concerned if the owner moves into the ADU they are no longer in compliance.

The Board disagreed.

The Coordinator explained #3 says the owner can live in either dwelling unit on the lot, #9 says the detached or ADU cannot be converted to a PDU, meaning once the Board allowed an owner to build an ADU it can't be changed to a PDU.

Mark Fougere stated the intent is to reword the actual amendment, hold off on the Public Hearing and renotice it for January 13, 2017.

DALLMAN, LAURA M.

Submission of Application/Public Hearing/Non-Residential Site Plan Review/Home Business/Family Daycare

Location: 149 Mont Vernon Road

Tax Map/Lot #11/9-2

Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District (cont)

Laura Dallman was present and explained she is planning a home based daycare. It would be located mainly in the bottom level of her home and a spare room in the upper level.

DALLMAN, LAURA M, CONTINUED

Laura will be the owner/operator. She needs Planning Board approval to get her license and licensing will determine the number of children participating in the daycare. She never plans to care for more than six children at a time but has to have a state license for that to happen. She also explained if one licensed person works at the business six non-school aged and three school aged children are allowed for a maximum of nine children. She is not planning to hire any employees. She will be the only owner/operator of the business.

The Board reviewed the application submitted and had some comments. They discussed their concerns and applicant follow up actions including:

- The plan needs a date the Board signs off on the plan.
- The driveway is on a state road and is also a shared driveway. For this reason the Board recommends a sign to make it clear to people coming to the business they are going the right way and not to the neighbor. The Building Inspector handles the details such as type of sign, the Board approves the location of the sign. The applicant will contact the Building Inspector for a sign and propose a plan for location and type of sign.
- Hours of operation Monday through Friday 6:30AM-6:00 PM will be added to the plan.
- Parking: Regulations allow up to and not more than two parking spaces that need to be delineated clearly so anyone coming to the property will park where Laura tells them to park. The applicant will delineate parking spaces on the plan with markings such as a sign or curb. Only two cars can be parked for children drop off and pick up at a time.
- Laura noted lighting and the driveway permit exist.

The Board scheduled a site walk for Saturday, December 17, 2016, at 8:00 a.m.

Laura Dallman noted she spoke to her neighbor who expressed concern of traffic in the driveway. She and the neighbor agree to the sign so people coming up the driveway will have no reason to be on the neighbor's property at all.

The Board adjourned this item to January 10, 2017 at 6:45 p.m.

Angela & William Fitzpatrick & Michael DePetrillo & Karen Lewis, for Lilla Holdings, LLC, for the property located on High Street & Depot Road, Tax Map/Lot #'s 18/1 & 18/41, in the Commercial "COM" District, owned by Angela & William Fitzpatrick & Michael DePetrillo & Karen Lewis, for Lilla Holdings, LLC

Karen Lewis and Michael DePetrillo were present in the audience.

The Coordinator explained Karen Lewis and Michael DePetrillo will meet with the Zoning Board of Adjustment at their January 17, 2017 meeting for a variance to accommodate what they would like to do.

Mark Suennen asked is there a reason to adjust the lot line, who owns the shed and who will own the shed.

Michael DePetrillo explained he has researched this matter and learned the initial survey in that area of town was 1949 and no one has looked at the pins since then. Drift has occurred. The natural delineation between these two properties is a strong declination hill. Everyone over multiple owners has assumed the bottom of the hill is Michael's property, the top of the hill is owned by the Fitzpatrick's on High Street, giving these properties a nice level lot and natural delineation. Michael's property has bled over the line. He has been researching and went back through tax cards to about 1975 and learned that has been the assumed line by the property owners and the town Assessor. A garage and shed were built and the area was paved and Michael was shocked to learn it was not on his property. The Fitzpatricks have indicated they don't want the buildings. This was discussed with the Assessor in 2001, the property was walked, it was half an acre and it was assumed the property line was the bottom of the hill, the buildings were part of the DePetrillos' property. Michael does not know what the Assessor has done about the buildings. The tax card plot was cut down by 10000 square foot difference. Michael had a survey to pin hole the buildings to get an accurate building permit for eventual reconstruction of the garage that he can't do until this is done. It has been in continuous use on his property for over forty years. It contains junk building materials and friends park their cars in front. He wants to make sure there is no break in his use of the property. He noted neither property will ever be a conforming lot by definition. This arrangement will not affect anyone other than the two property owners involved. The Fitzpatricks will give up perceived square footage they never knew they had and Michael will be able to tear the garage down. The new line is staked in black, the old line is a pin in the middle of the road about the halfway mark.

Peter Hogan noted there is nothing here that would make the Board view this unfavorably.

The Board continued this item to January 24, 2017 at 7:15 p.m. if applicant is heard at the January 17, 2017 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. The deadline to be heard at the meeting is December 28, 2016.

Discussion re: Additions to New Boston Building Code

The Coordinator distributed a handout of additional items the Fire Inspector was going to discuss with the Board at the November 22, 2016 meeting about firefighting water supply. The Coordinator prepared a memo today and the format for the Board.

The Building Inspector was present to answer any questions the Board had. He noted these are additional items that required commendation as they are above and beyond code NFPA101-1 or 72 for fire alarm system, needed so procedures can begin around town to improve fire safety and operations of the Fire Department. The recommended changes were reviewed as follows:

- Fire Extinguishers: Establish minimum size extinguishers for commercial and industrial occupancies and there may be some times extinguishers are required to be larger for certain hazards or occupancies. The standard minimum would be a ten pound all-purpose extinguisher. That is not established in any other NFPA code, particularly for size.

The Board noted the language is vague.

Rodney Towne noted there is a standard under codes when a building is built requiring a certain amount of extinguishers according to the size of the building and that could be referenced in this code.

The Board has no problem with the ten pound size. The Chairman said it should be added that fire extinguishers shall be a minimum ten pound size.

- Fire Alarm Systems: By code, commercial and industrial alarm systems are required to be monitored by an alarm service to ensure Fire Department response. NFPA codes don't currently establish that requirement for New Boston. The changes also go into more detail updating Fire Alarms to current technology. 7.1.5 fire alarm systems would have a cat30 key, which is a standard key for fire alarm panels so the Fire Department can always get into the system and there is no confusion about which key opens the system for the resetting they do.

Ed Carroll asked if fire alarm systems are hard wired and if this takes affect would that necessitate hard wiring and extra cost? Rodney Towne said hard wiring is not required in New Boston and if this regulation is added New Boston will not incur extra costs.

- Lock Boxes: The Fire Department uses a lock box system to get the entry key for immediate access to a building. At any hour if an alarm is going off the Fire Department would go to a vault on the side of the building that holds a key and any other information needed about hazardous materials and occupancy of the building.

The Board agreed to this change.

Discussion re: Additions to New Boston Building Code cont.

Rodney Towne noted the recommended system is better than the system the Fire Department currently uses. The recommended system is the Knox box system that allows businesses to keep the key secure on their property. New Boston is starting to use this system with businesses and if an emergency responder wants the Knox box key they have to call dispatch to have it released from the device.

- Tents: A situation occurred a couple years ago in another town where a tent was not put up properly. The state Fire Marshall is now requiring Fire Departments to inspect tents to make sure they are constructed of fire retardant materials and put up properly to ensure it will stay up during storms, etc. The Fire Department would require a permit to put up a tent and make sure when it is up that it is done right with the right safety systems in place. 10x12 is the minimum size requiring a permit established by the Fire Marshall.

Rodney Towne asked if it is the intent of this change to inspect backyard tents. The Building Inspector said this applies to commercial use.

The Coordinator noted that when amendments come forward to the Planning Board they often get legal counsel review. This language has not had legal counsel review as it was received last week. It is now late in the year to get it on the 2017 Warrant. The Fire Inspector was told it was late when he brought the Fire Department water supply regulations the Board is working on now. David Litwinovich suggested in the future a deadline for submissions to the Board should be noted so these types of things do not come to the Board too late. The Coordinator noted these types of items are discussed throughout the year, she sends an e-mail or memo in the fall to the appropriate departments requesting discussion on proposed zoning ordinances.

The Building Inspector noted it is ok to postpone this to the 2018 Warrant. The Board should send a letter back to the Fire Inspector for reconsideration of the language for next year's Warrant.

The Board decided not to add this item to its list of goals.

The Coordinator is updating the goals spreadsheet.

Sign adjustments will go on the Board 2017 goals and be sent to legal counsel review. Mark Suennen asked if there are any issues with interpretation of the sign ordinance in New Boston other than the court case. The Building Inspector said there are no other issues. He said there was a concern when a sign application is submitted if the sign meets the standard or not. He read the court case and determined if there is an established sign it doesn't matter what the sign says, but under New Boston's ordinance size is variable and it matters what the sign says. He recommends waiting on this matter for now.

The Chairman asked the status of the antique restoration business situation that was referred to the town attorney.

Discussion re: Additions to New Boston Building Code cont.

The Building Inspector said he recently spoke to the attorney's office on the phone about the history of the business.

The Chairman noted the history according to the letter the Board received is wrong as the business was never granted an expansion, the Board granted the first site plan and never had one before.

The Building Inspector said the owner had one prior to three years ago when he came before the Board.

The Coordinator explained there was always an unpermitted business, the owner finally came in and received a site plan. Three years ago he came back to revise the plan to remove containers he had installed that were not in compliance around his property. The plan the Chairman saw was not the original site plan, it was for container removal. The business operated illegally before that.

The Building Inspector said there was a home business approval from the Board with a drawing, the owner came back in for approval of six storage containers that were already installed. The Building Inspector determined he could not have the storage containers as they were a violation of the zoning, too close to the property line. The Board then stated three storage containers were allowed. The owner chose to remove all of them and told the Building Inspector he did that because they were too costly and there was not enough room on the property to move them twenty feet from the property line as he had been asked to do.

The Chairman asked if the owner could be issued a fine for each day the business is in violation.

The Building Inspector noted he cannot levy fines, only the court can do that at \$275 per day for violations. He noted that is why it is important to have a Cease and Desist in place to establish a set date. The best way to do that is to have an attorney prepare it to make sure it contains all proper language. The Cease and Desist goes to court before any fines are levied and the owner has to be found guilty. Superior Court is preferred over District Court. The Board thanked Ed for this information.

The Chairman asked if this is the case even in the event of a site plan violation.

The Building Inspector noted the owner could be brought to the Board to let him know the business is in violation as was done with the Tremblay wood operation for revocation of the site plan.

The Coordinator asked if this matter is still with the attorney.

The Building Inspector noted the matter is with Attorney Mayer who has had it for approximately two weeks. There was a delay as the original communication had fallen through the cracks at his office. Attorney Mayer called and apologized and immediately began working on it after the Town Administrator contacted him for a status. The Building Inspector then copied the file and mailed it to Attorney Mayer two weeks ago. The Building Inspector will follow up for status.

The Chairman asked if there is anything the Board can do to allow the Building Inspector better enforcement of Board approved site plans.

The Building Inspector said no, compliance is preferred but there are chronic problems at times for which the court system is available. The Board can also review site plans for revision.

The Coordinator also noted the plans could be brought back before the Board for a Public Hearing for revocation but the matter could end up in court anyway in that situation.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 13, 2016

Miscellaneous Business for the meeting of December 13, 2016, including, but not limited to:

1. Letter dated December 8, 2016 received from Nicholas Isaia owner of HHD Armory, 250 Middle Branch Road regarding business license for Board review and discussion.

Nicholas Isaia was present in the audience. He explained he spoke to ATF who recommended his license application be changed to a manufacturing license. He would need Board approval to do so. This recommendation is due to a government battle occurring on if gunsmithing is considered manufacturing. Nicholas' plan involves gluing and clearcoating which involves taking a part and regluing it and finishing it a color. He explained hydrodipping as taking the part and dipping it in waterpaint. Hydrodipping is now considered manufacturing.

Nicholas also noted he wants his business to grow and it would be considered manufacturing if he gets into custom manufacturing. He has decided it is probably best to move forward with a manufacturing license now to avoid an additional licensing process as the business grows and also due to hydrodipping and gunsmithing as regulations and definitions may change. Nothing has changed as far as his business plan as discussed previously with the Board.

The Chairman asked about test firing.

Nicholas said test firing will be done at the lanes he is involved with in Peterborough. Due to proximity of his neighbors test firing is not allowed at his property.

A Member said he has no problem with this, it seems reasonable but he wouldn't want to allow flexibility to grow to the point where the business is receiving shipments of dozens of barrels and firing pins and being put together and sold wholesale.

Nicholas said that is not his intention at all, if that comes up in the future he would have to follow federal guidelines and meet with the Board as that is a change in the business plan, getting into manufacturing, the business would be growing and changing in a different direction and a different facility would be needed.

The Coordinator noted when this was approved it was specifically approved for a federally licensed firearms sales home business and had nothing to do with manufacturing or what is being discussed. She said it is ok to go forward with this addition but at the prior meeting there was an outline summary of the business that described what would be done utilizing a very small space in his kitchen. An amendment probably needs to be agreed upon.

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF
DECEMBER 13, 2016 cont.**

Nicolas said the manufacturing license covers the sales, transactions and transfers. Even when he gets into hydrodipping he would have to install a shed in his yard to hold the tanks, as his business grows this will have to happen. If he gets into gluing he will have to get the Fire Department involved as propane will need to be set up in the building and he will have to let them know what is on the property in case something happens. As of right now, nothing is changing from the original plan. He explained the plan to ATF as he explained it to the Board previously and the ATF then recommended a license that covers anything and everything he needs for licensing with firearms including sales, transfers and transactions. He needs to make sure he has the proper license.

The Chairman noted he has no problem with manufacturing or gunsmithing as long as it doesn't involve cases and cases of assembly or wholesale trade. The biggest concern to him is the area Nicholas lives in and the chemicals dipping may require, that probably wouldn't be done on the property anyway. He asked how much of the ATF license is contingent on Board approval.

Nicholas said if the Board denies it he would get the previously planned license and may limit his business. He is not sure yet which chemicals are used for bluing.

The Chairman suggested Nicholas work toward approval of manufacturing but prohibit a defined quantity of material on site, limiting the amount of chemicals on site.

Nicholas noted the bluing chemical considered is \$2,500 for five gallon containers. The hydrodipping tank is ten feet long and three to four feet tall. Videos are available on line.

The Chairman noted that is for a different site plan review. If the Board allows the business to be a manufacturer but prohibits bluing or hydrodipping because he wouldn't be doing that until he comes back in for a site plan review. He can technically do assembly and if the ATF wants to call that manufacturing, Board approval will be for manufacturing but not recoating a firearm.

Rodney Towne noted if chemicals are needed on site the applicant needs to get details to the Board.

Nicholas noted Board approval is needed before the applicant can get an ATF license but that does not mean everything the manufacturing license allows him to do is permitted at the business at this time.

Nicholas said right now the Board would be permitting sales, reloading, transfers and transactions of firearms only.

The Chairman noted the applicant wants the Board to add manufacturing to the permit and the Board wants to exclude liquid processing if the chemicals are dangerous.

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF
DECEMBER 13, 2016 cont.**

Nicholas noted for bluing he would send a letter to the Board to let them know what the chemicals are.

The Chairman asked what would happen if the Board prohibits bluing until further site plan review.

Nicholas said he would be ok with that for now and at the time he wants to get into services such as bluing he would have to use another location on his property for the business, and at that time, through due diligence he would let the Fire Department know about the chemicals in case there is a fire.

The Chairman suggested remove “customer supplied” as Nicholas may help a customer order the supplies to be assembled.

Mark Suennen said manufacturing exclusive of chemical manufacturing of parts/chemical processes, cosmetics of firearms without further Board review.

Nicholas said when the time comes he will come back to the Board to discuss and let the Fire Department know.

The Chairman said at that time Nicholas would bring safe practices information, etc. Right now the Board doesn't have that information and will delay the chemical portion.

Rodney Towne said the chemical portion would be a significant change to the site plan and it would have to be renoticed at that time.

Nicholas explained clearcoating is a type of spray paint and should be allowed under the current site plan.

The Board agreed.

The Chairman suggested Nicholas submit a letter with revisions and the Board will accept that as an amendment to the site plan.

Nicholas will revise to include manufacturing excluding hazardous chemicals cosmetic processes.

The Coordinator asked Nicholas to keep the brief outline summary of the business with the site plan, add at the bottom “amended date” and submit that to her before the next Board meeting January 10, 2017 to be used as an amendment to approve and notify Nicholas of the outcome.

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE MEETING OF
DECEMBER 13, 2016 cont.**

2. Approval of the October 26, 2016, meeting minutes with or without changes. (distributed by email)

Mark Suennen **MOVED** to approve the October 26, 2016, meeting minutes as modified. David Litwinovich seconded the motion and it **PASSED** unanimously.

3. Distribution of the November 22, 2016 meeting minutes for approval at the January 10, 2017 meeting. Valerie Diaz will e-mail these to the Board tomorrow.
4. Updated Planning Board 2017 goal spreadsheet for Board review and discussion.
 - The Coordinator added under Zoning Ordinance Subdivisions and Site Plan-Signs and to continue working on 55 plus house regulations for next year.
 - Firefighting Water Supply-Board will have to decide to invite them in or how to deal with this. The Chairman asked what is the status of the sprinkler regulations with the legislature. Mark Fougere noted his most recent recollection is communities are prohibited from requiring sprinklers for one and two family homes, but, if a community already has the regulation it can keep it. The Chairman noted New Boston's regulation is it is builder's choice to use cisterns or sprinklers. Mark Fougere noted one of the debates since the statute changed is could a developer offer sprinklers in homes in lieu of putting in a cistern. A Member noted New Boston's regulation is if a developer doesn't install sprinklers they default to another water supply system. Rodney Towne noted no water supply system is required or developers can default to sprinklers. Mark Fougere noted sprinklers can't be enforced but another water supply system can.
 - Ed Carroll noted he is curious about the list of roads for the Master Plan. The Coordinator noted Joe Constance is the person to talk to about that. Mark Suennen noted this may have fallen apart because the software was being changed. Mark Fougere noted GIS will make this much easier. GIS is on the CIP Schedule for 2020 or 2021.
 - The Coordinator asked if the Board has any more goals let her know and she will add them to the list.

5. E-mail dated December 7, 2016 from Town Administrator Peter Flynn to Town Attorney Bill Drescher regarding Thibeault Gravel Pit for Board review and discussion. This pit continues to need reclamation and the owner has not done it. The Coordinator noted this came up again after Vinnie Iacozzi came in a few weeks ago and requested a letter from the town as lot Map 6 Lot 45 is sold but the bank needs a letter saying it is no longer a gravel pit with dates included. The Coordinator pulled the file, researched it and drafted a letter for Vinnie citing the last time the Selectmen permitted that pit. The Planning Board never permitted it through earth removal regulations because he never complied or reclaimed. The last time the Planning Board brought this up was April when the Board asked the Town Administrator to contact legal counsel. The Town Administrator then

contacted Town Attorney Bill Drescher to ask him what to do based on the situation where they now have the pit under contract, it is not reclaimed, the question is will the person who buys the pit have any liability. The town has a bond still in place for reclamation but it is not a permitted pit and the town allowed them to never go through the permitting process. It may be time to call the bond. The town is waiting to hear from Bill with answers. The Coordinator drafted a letter to Vinnie and notified him the pit has not been reclaimed and he is responsible for that. Vinnie e-mailed and said the bank doesn't want to see that. The Coordinator responded and said the information has to follow with the property. The sale is supposed to close the end of January. Renter Rumore Drilling and Blasting is planning to purchase the property.

- 6a. Copy of Municipal Sign Ordinance Town of Gilbert, Do's and Don'ts prepared by the NH Municipal Association for the Board's information and
- 6b. Copy of the New Boston Sign Ordinance Section 318 Signs, for Board's review and discussion. The Board will review it at home and discuss at another meeting. Based on that court case, the Coordinator marked up Section 318 Signs with comments. The Board should work on this throughout the year and then send it to legal counsel as changes are expected. Mark Fougere noted this involves a lot of regulation. This item is on the list of goals.
7. Letter dated December 15, 2016 from Valerie Diaz to the Coordinator-resignation for the Board's information. The Board thanked Valerie for her accurate service and will miss her. The position has been posted.
8. Invitation from the New Boston Fire Association to Board members to their Annual Oyster Stew Supper for the Board's information.
9. Letter received from Carol Frey to the New Boston Planning Board request for non-residential site plan review waiver for the Board's review and discussion. The Coordinator noted Carol is a realtor and the state Board of Realtors requires that if she has a home office she have a sign. She is going to have a home office for her use only, not going to have customers, employees, parking or any of the criteria that goes along with a home business site plan. She wrote the letter to the Board to ask not to do the site plan or the Board of Realtors' requirement that she have a sign out front. She is asking if she can say the sign is not permitted by local ordinances and the Board give her the standard waiver. The Board reviewed the sign ordinance in Zoning Section 318. The Board suggested writing her a letter saying under the outline she is allowed to have a home office but not allowed to have a sign as a start. The Board will consider this again if it is not acceptable to the Board of Realtors. The letter will include that she is not required to have a site review. The Coordinator will contact Carol.

Continued Discussion, re: Master Plan Update

Mark Fougere submitted drafts of the two changes.

David Litwinovich commented on Housing as he thought the Housing Guidelines and Actions were addressed in the Goals and Objectives section and don't need to be repeated, or, if they are repeated, should match the opening section and Land Use. The Board agreed to strike the repeating language and reference the prior language in this section.

David Litwinovich noted at the end there is a Recommendation section that should be in the Goals and Objectives section. Mark Fougere noted Recommendations wouldn't go in the Goals and Objectives and Goals and Objectives are broad policy statements and Recommendations are specific action items.

The Regional Housing Assessment that was previously referenced is now outdated and was removed from the Master Plan as it is not useful. Mark Fougere contacted SNHPC last week and learned there has been no effort and there are no plans for SNHPC to update it.

Mark Fougere noted the next thing he is going to start working on is traffic/transportation. The Road Committee is mostly inactive so he will work with the Road Agent and Regional Planning on this.

Respectfully submitted,
Maralyn Segien, Selectmen's Assistant/Recording Clerk

Approved 4/11/17