

PLANNING BOARD
Selectman's Meeting Room
RINDGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE
August 20, 2013

DATE: August 20, 2013 TYPE: Public Meeting APPROVED: 9-3-2013

TIME: 7:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER:

Planning Board Members: Chairman Kirk Stenersen, Vice Chair Kim McCummings, Hank Whitney, Phil Simeone, Bruce Donati, Charlie Eicher

Planning Board Alternates: Burt Goodrich, Holly Koski (8:30pm)

EX OFFICIO: Roberta Oeser

PLANNING DIRECTOR:

PLANNING SECRETARY: Susan Hoyland

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

OTHERS PRESENT Dick Drew, Dan Ketola, Gisela and Steve Johnson, David Drouin, Carlotta Lilback Pini, Roger Hawk, Bethany Paquin (8:00PM)

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Stenersen said that he had been in contact with **Chip Fredette from Verizon re: the Jones Farm Collocation**. Everything is in place, the antennas are up and this was scheduled to be turned on during the first quarter of 2013. The plan is to turn Jaffrey and Rindge on at the same time. There are some issues in Jaffrey with no known construction schedule at this time. Chairman Stenersen said that he has asked Chip Fredette to keep us posted on this.

Vice Chair Kim McCummings said that the Farmer's Market is going strong and will be open until Columbus Day. There are plans for an indoor market again this winter.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. August 6, 2013 Public Session

MOTION: Roberta Oeser moved to approve the minutes of August 6, 2013. Phil Simeone seconded the motion. **Vote: 7-0-0**

- b. August 6, 2013 Site Walk

MOTION: Phil Simeone moved to approve the minutes of August 6, 2013 site walk. Kim McCummings seconded the motion. **Vote: 6-0-1** Chairman Stenersen abstained.

3. OLD BUSINESS

a. Continued from August 6, 2013: CONSIDERATION OF an application for a Minor Subdivision submitted by Kohlmorgen Housing -2 LLC. The property is located at Tax Map 8, Lot 7-4 Wallace Road. The applicant is seeking approval for a two lot subdivision. Paul Grasewicz of GRAZ Engineering will be presenting this proposed plan*

*(Richard Kohlmorgen has requested that this be continued to September 3,).

Planning Board Meeting Minutes
August 20, 2013 KS, KM, PS, RO, HW, CE, BD, HK, SH

MOTION: Roberta Oeser moved to continue this hearing until September 3, 2013. Kim McCummings seconded the motion. **Vote: 7-0-0**

Chairman Stenersen recused himself.

Vice Chair Kim McCummings appointed alternate, Burt Goodrich, to sit for Kirk Stenersen.

b. Continued from August 6, 2013: CONSIDERATION OF: an application for a Minor Subdivision submitted by Richard P. Drew LLC on behalf of Daniel Ketola. The property is located at Tax Map 5, Lot 9-5-1, Abel and Bean Hill Roads. The applicant is seeking approval for a two lot subdivision.

Richard Drew presented tonight for Dan Ketola. He said, that at the last meeting, the Board asked for a new plan showing the other side of Gillis Lane. Mr. Drew distributed a new set of plans with corrections that were requested. At the last meeting, the board also questioned the slope of the driveway. He said that the slope is a bit less than 12%. At the last meeting, a question of ownership of an undivided one half interest in the road was discussed. Mr. Drew provided the board with an affidavit from Alain Choquette (which referred to a maintenance agreement) as well as a copy of potential new deeds conveying $\frac{1}{4}$ undivided interest in the road to Lots 9-5-1-1 and 9-5-1-2.

Roberta Oeser said that the issue the board had was not a question of maintenance but a question of ownership and that Alain Choquette's Affidavit did not address that. Mr. Drew apologized and said that there was a misunderstanding between himself and his attorney. Kirk Stenersen (from the audience) said that the ownership and deed issues could be addressed as a condition precedent, to an approval of this subdivision, with a review by Town Counsel.

Bruce Donati asked if the fill in the wetlands buffer had been removed. Dan Ketola said that it had not been yet, but that it will be. Vice Chair McCummings said that that could also be a condition of approval and will be inspected by the Planning Board or their representative.

As there were no more questions from the Board, Vice Chair McCummings invited the public to speak.

Steve Johnson of 162 Able Road addressed the board. Mr. Johnson spoke passionately about his opposition to this subdivision. He said that it was his understanding from a previous planning board that no further subdivisions would take place in this area. He said he believes that while they may not have 'written it down', that was the intent of that Board. He said he is deeply disappointed, feels let down by the Planning Board, and asked how many more subdivisions could take place. Mr. Johnson said when he first bought his property on Able Road, there was nothing there. He said the boom has been relentless over the years and more and more houses are going in. He asked when it is going to stop. Mr. Johnson asked the Board not to approve this subdivision as there are already too many houses on this road.

Roberta Oeser said that she was on the Planning Board when this issue was addressed. She agreed with Steve Johnson that she too thought that it was the intent of the Board not to allow further

subdivisions. She said they were concerned about the high land on Bean Hill Road. She said that as the Board did not put written restrictions on this land at that time, it could not be done now.

Dick Drew said that he and his client have met the subdivision requirements of the Town of Rindge and are therefore allowed to subdivide. Vice Chair McCummings said that Mr. Drew and his client, Dan Ketola have worked with the Planning Board to meet all requirements and answer all questions that the Board has brought before them. She said that additional subdivisions would not be possible at this time, but may be possible in the future if there is an upgrade to the classification of the Bean Hill Road. Many members said that a road upgrade would be very costly.

David Drouin cautioned this board from saying that this cannot be further subdivided because of the classification of Bean Hill Road. He said that this town has a history of accepting roads as town roads. There is also the opportunity to apply for a variance should a landowner want to seek relief from current ordinances. There are no guarantees of what may take place in the future.

The Board discussed the conditions and agreed that three conditions would be part of this approval. They are:

CONDITIONS PRECEDENT:

1. Corrections to the original and proposed deeds to show a conveyance of two-thirds of the road to Daniel Ketola so that he can convey one-third to lot 9-5-1-1 and that these deed(s) be reviewed by Town Counsel.
2. Removal of fill from the wetlands buffer. This will be inspected by the Planning Board or their representative.
3. A proposed road maintenance agreement to be reviewed by Town Counsel.

MOTION: Phil Simeone moved to accept the minor subdivision on behalf of Daniel Ketola, Tax Map 5, Lot 9-5-1, Abel and Bean Hill Roads with the aforementioned conditions. Bruce Donati seconded the motion. Vote: 6-0-1 Roberta Oeser abstained.

Chairman Stenersen returned to the table.

4. NEW BUSINESS

b. CONSIDERATION OF an application for a Technical Subdivision submitted by D. L. Breckenridge Trust of 2006 and John D. Heikkinen Revocable Trust of 2008. The property is located at Tax Map 11, Lots 38, 39 and 39-1 located on Old New Ipswich Road. The applicant is seeking approval for a technical subdivision.

Chairman Stenersen said that he did the completion review on this application. He did find a minor omission which Dick Drew has since corrected.

Planning Board Meeting Minutes
August 20, 2013 KS, KM, PS, RO, HW, CE, BD, HK, SH

Dick Drew is presenting this application this evening on behalf of John Heikkinen.

Dick Drew said that this plan shows two lots: one with a house on it in the front and a second lot in the back. These lots were merged involuntarily by the assessors. Dick Drew showed the board a letter from Dave Duvernay stating that this involuntary merger has been unmerged. Mr. Drew said that in order to give the back lot frontage, he needed to reshape the lots. The reason for the strange shape is due to the location of the septic system for the house.

Roberta Oeser asked why the back lot wasn't just given a right of way rather than going through this technical subdivision. Dick Drew said that they had tried that about two years ago and it was not approved.

Chairman Stenersen asked for any further questions on completeness of the application.

Bruce Donati said that on Note Two, the title reference needs correction. He believes it should say Book 2387 Page 739. The reference that is listed is for a mortgage. Dick Drew said that he would check this.

MOTION: Roberta Oeser moved to accept the plan as complete. Kim McCummings seconded the motion. **Vote: 7-0-0**

Chairman Stenersen asked if the Lot 39-1 required state subdivision approval. Dick Drew said no, it did not.

Daniel Breckenridge asked the board what a technical subdivision was. Chairman Stenersen said that a technical subdivision creates no new lots but adjusts the boundary lines.

Daniel Breckenridge asked if John would be allowed to build more than one house on this lot. Dick Drew said that Mr. Breckenridge can address this between himself and John Heikkinen.

MOTION: Phil Simeone moved to approve this application for technical subdivision. Kim McCummings seconded the motion. **Vote: 7-0-0**

c. DISCUSSION WITH Roger Hawk and the CPG Steering Committee

8:00 PM to 8:30 PM

Roger Hawk said that tonight's presentation and discussion would be:

- **What Makes Rindge architecture feel like Classic New England?**

He showed slides of several 'typical' Rindge homes which had the following design elements in common:

- Steep Roofs
- Overhangs

- Symmetrical Front Faces
- Vertically oriented windows
- Wood siding with wide trim boards
- Front porches
- Bay Windows

Roger Hawk said that if you told an architect you were looking for a Greek Revival design with Victorian design influences, he or she would know precisely what you meant. These items are not big cost items and can be used, within a residential scale, to secure the types of buildings that the Town of Rindge residents desire.

The Board discussed the following:

- The intention to not set design standards (that must be adhered to) but rather to offer design guidelines so that the architects and builders will have a sense of what the community wants.
- Providing guidelines may not require a vote of the town to incorporate into the planning process
- The need for pictures of small, medium and large sized buildings using this concept.
- The need to educate and include the public in this decision making process
- “Big house, back house and barn” architecture.
- Brick, stone and wood designs. Brick and stone are rarely used in Rindge but are attractive.

Roger Hawk asked the Board to complete a homework assignment within the next month. He asked that they all take pictures of businesses in their travels. These examples (both bad and good) will be used to help set up the guidelines. Roger asked the Board to give these pictures to Susan who can forward them to Roger.

No definite date was set for the next meeting. Roger Hawk will work on an outline of the design guidelines and be in touch.

5. Planning Department Report

b. Discussion: SWRPC dues with Carlotta Lilback Pini and Richard Mellor

Carlotta said that she has brought this before the board to move the question about SWRPC (Southwestern Regional Planning Commission) dues. Are we going to rejoin? And if so, who will pay for it?

During her address to the Board, Carlotta said the following:

- She has spoken with the Board of Selectmen who have requested more information relative to the benefits they would enjoy by rejoining.

Planning Board Meeting Minutes
August 20, 2013 KS, KM, PS, RO, HW, CE, BD, HK, SH

- That regional planning commissions were set up to serve municipalities in the state and to encourage regional planning so that each little town was not an island unto itself.
- That there are many regional issues, transportation being a large one to consider
- That, if not for SWRPC, we would not be a participant in the FastRoads project.
- SWRPC is a good resource for training and development
- It is her belief that applications for highway or state grant aid must go through SWRPC
- SWRPC has been involved in Energy projects from which we have gained benefit.
- The Town of Rindge has benefited from work done by SWRPC without paying. It is time to step up and pay for its fair share.
- She is willing to consider splitting the cost between other town departments and is asking the Planning Board if they would utilize money not spent to date for a Planning Director to help fund the cost to rejoin SWRPC.

The Planning Board discussed this request and considered the following:

- To wait until a Planning Director is hired to make this decision
- That the cost should be shared amongst many departments and not just Planning
- Some members question the value given the tight budget constraints
- Some members questioned the value given that we will have a Planning Director and will need fewer services through SWRPC
- Some members said that we should pay our fair share to regional planning.

MOTION: Roberta Oeser moved to contribute \$1000 towards the dues for SWRPC. Phil Simeone seconded the motion. **Vote: 5-2-0** Bruce and Charlie voted No.

a. Discussion: Impact Fees

Chairman Stenersen said that the Planning Board needs to address the Impact Fee ordinance. He has heard that there will most likely be a petition article placed on the ballot this coming March to rescind this ordinance in its entirety. Chairman Stenersen is suggesting perhaps doing away with the residential portion of this ordinance and keeping the commercial.

A discussion followed which included:

- A suggestion to suspend this ordinance for a period of two years and then revisit it.
- Taking away this impact fee will create a need for the tax rate to increase or for projects that are being worked on to come to a halt
- Eliminating Impact fees for all ADUs
- Since the economic downturn, Impact Fees are an impediment to people being able to build a house or live in this town
- The impact on capital improvements should this revenue source be taken away
- Housing driving the economy and how this fee hurts that cycle
- Suspending versus eliminating
- Eliminating all but Multi Family and Commercial
- Ellen Smith's memo and the actual gains/losses associated with this decision

Planning Board Meeting Minutes
August 20, 2013 KS, KM, PS, RO, HW, CE, BD, HK, SH

- Increasing the commercial impact fee
- A suggestion that the Planning Dept. support the CIP and have a conversation of how to plan for and provide for capital improvements
- The Impact Fee was implemented at a time when slowing down growth was an objective. This is not the case at this time.

MOTION: Roberta Oeser moved to go to Public Hearing for a discussion about the removal of the impact fees on certain structures. Phil Simeone seconded the motion. Vote: 6-0-1 Kim McCummings abstained.

6. Non Public Session per RSA 91-A:3IIb for Personnel Matters

MOTION: Kim McCummings moved to go to Non-Public Session per RSA 91-A: 3IIb for Personnel Matters. Roberta Oeser seconded the motion. **Roll Call Vote:** Bruce Donati-AYE Kim McCummings-AYE Phil Simeone-AYE Kirk Stenersen-AYE Hank Whitney-AYE: Roberta Oeser-AYE - Charlie Eicher-AYE

Adjourned at 9:45 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Hoyland
Planning Secretary