

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

**PLANNING BOARD
RINDGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE
July 7, 2020**

DATE: July 7, 2020 **TYPE:** Public Hearing **APPROVED:** August 4, 2020

TIME: 7:01 pm

CALL TO ORDER: 7:01 PM

ROLL CALL MEMBERS: Jonah Ketola, Sam Bouchie, Jason Paolino, Kim McCummings, Holly Koski,

ROLL CALL ALTERNATES: Cheves Walling, Katelyn Smith (arrived after roll call)

ABSENT: Dennis Casey

EX OFFICIO: Roberta Oeser

PLANNING DIRECTOR: Kirk Stenersen

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES: Cheves Walling for Dennis Casey

OTHERS PRESENT: Kelley E. Dowd, Deni Dickler, Jeff Dickler, Sharon Rasku, Albert Lefebvre, Judy Unger-Clark, Nate Chamberlain, Frank Stewart, Larry Cleveland, Roniele Hamilton, Earl W Coles, Jr., Karla Macleod, Ashley Saari, Aaron Niser, Armando Golisano, James Golisano, Nathaniel Merren, Jennifer Merrell, Andrew Merrell, Joel Kaplan, Ray & Penny Rodriquez, Pete Wortaley, Arwen Mellor, Jim Qualey, Bob Hamilton, Casey Burrage, Dave Leveda, Rick Donovan, Betty Commerford

Call to order and Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Jonah Ketola called the meeting to order 7:01pm

Roll call by Chairperson

Kirk Stenersen Planning Director, Samuel Bouchie, Kim McCummings, Jason Paolino, Jonah Ketola Chairman, Roberta Oeser, Holly Koski, Chevis Walling, Katelyn Smith (arrived after introductions)

Appointment of alternates, if necessary.

Cheves Walling for Dennis Casey

Announcements and Communications

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked attendees to sign in on the sheet at the back of the gymnasium if they hadn't already done so. He also asked audience members to maintain silence so that people can hear what board members and speakers are saying. To ask questions raise your hand and when acknowledged by Chairman Ketola come to the table, speak loudly when addressing the board, state your name and ask your question.

Kirk Stenersen announced that the part time Planning Secretary position had been filled by Kim McCummings and that Kim will be working with Susan for training through the end of the year.

Approval of Minutes:

1. June 2, 2020

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

MOTION: Roberta Oeser moved to approve the minutes. Kim McCummings seconded the motion. Vote: Yes - 5, No- 0, Abstain – 2, (Sam Bouchie, Cheves Walling). Minutes of June 2, 2020 are accepted.

Old Business/Continued Public Hearings

None

New Business/ Public Hearings

Chairman Jonah Ketola read the case into the record.

1. **CONSIDERATION OF** an application for a Minor Subdivision submitted by Jason Gorman, P.O. Box 137, Rindge, NH 03461, for property located at Map 7 Lot 74 at 36 Old New Ipswich Road. The applicant is seeking approval of a 2 lot subdivision, in the Residential-Agricultural Zoning District.

Chairman Jonah Ketola, announced that Kirk Stenersen of Higher Design PLLC is the engineer of record for this case and would NOT be participating as Planning Director. Jonah read the background information into the record.

Chairman Jonah Ketola announced that alternate Katelyn Smith arrived and was seated as an alternate.

Chairman Jonah Ketola read the background information into the record

Background Information:

1. Jason Gorman, P.O. Box 137, Rindge, NH 03461 has submitted for approval of a 2 lot subdivision of land located at Tax Map 7 Lot 74 in the Residential-Agricultural Zoning District.
2. The purpose of this plat is to subdivide Map 7 Lot 74 into two residential building lots.
3. Map 7 Lot 74 was removed from Lot 71 via an involuntary merger effective April 1, 2020
4. The applicant was granted a variance (case#1142) from the Zoning Board of Adjustment on April 28, 2020 for relief from frontage requirements in an effort to preserve a historic building and create two building lots.
5. The applicant has provided the Planning Board with the information necessary to make an informed decision on the application. I recommend the Planning Board accept this application as complete and open the public hearing.

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked for questions from the board. There were no questions and Chairman, Jonah Ketola asked Kirk Stenersen, to provide an overview of the case.

Kirk Stenersen introduced himself and stated he was standing in for Dick Drew who did the subdivision plans for the minor subdivision located on Tax Map 7 Lot 74, 36 Old New Ipswich Road, in between Rt 119 and Cutter Hill Road on the east side of the road. Parcel is located in the Residential Agriculture Zoning District. Currently there is an existing home on the parcel. With two

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

sections of frontage on Cutter Hill Road one section runs 179ft and the short section runs approximately 119 ft. (Pointed to the map to locate existing parcel). The proposal is to subdivide the parcel into two lots. Lot 74-1, shown on the plan with the existing home, existing well and septic system on two acres with 179ft of frontage. The second lot, currently with nothing on it, Lot 74-2 with 7.1 acres and 119.2ft of frontage.

Kirk Stenersen reviewed the plan for the board and audience

Kirk Stenersen said the question is why the parcel doesn't not have 250ft of frontage as required. He referenced the decision made by the Zoning Board of Adjustment Case 1142, a variance dated, April 28, 2020 approved to allow lesser frontage on the two proposed lots.

Kirk Stenersen said the applicant requested a waiver for topography for the entirety of the proposed Lot 74-2. He stated that "the current plan shows topography of the area to be developed along the access way and shows the driveway and the outlets. We show the developable area and nothing is to be gained by toping (sic) the entire back area".

Kirk Stenersen said State Subdivision approval is required for a 2acre lot, and that was received yesterday.

The applicant also mentioned that there had been consideration of getting a variance making the lot line (pointed out to the audience on the map) out to the boundaries that were bound within the stone walls, which would have changed the lot size to 1.67 acres to keep it entirely within the stone walls rather than going outside, but decided against it.

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked if the board had any questions. Roberta Oeser asked what section the waivers were requested under. Kirk Stenersen replied Section 5.2. B2. Holly Koski asked for clarification on the number of lots. Kirk Stenersen replied two lots. Chairman Ketola asked if there were additional questions from the board. There were none. Chairman Jonah Ketola asked for a motion to accept the application.

MOTION:

Roberta Oeser made a motion to accept the Minor Subdivision application for Tax Map 7 Lot 74 as presented as substantially complete to approve the waiver request from Section 5.2 B.2. Motion seconded by Jason Paolino. **Vote:** In favor – 7, Opposed – 0, Abstain – 0. **Application is accepted and Waiver is granted.**

Chairman Jonah Ketola read the information regarding the application

- 1) The proposed minor subdivision is located in the Residential-Agricultural District.
- 2) There is no public infrastructure or utilities proposed.
- 3) The existing Map 7 Lot 74 before subdivision is 9.13 acres.
- 4) The proposed lots are as follows:

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

<u>Lot#:</u>	<u>Area (sq. ft.):</u>	<u>Area (acres):</u>	<u>Frontage (ft.):</u>
74-1	87,138 sq. ft.	2.00 acres	179.00 ft.
74-2	310,668 sq. ft.	7.13 acres	119.24 ft.

- 5) The proposed lots will be accessed through their frontages onto Old New Ipswich Road.
- 6) The proposed lot 74-1 has an existing dwelling on the property.
- 7) The proposed lot 74-2 is an undeveloped parcel of land.

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked for further discussion. Jason Paolino asked for background information to elaborate why the variance was required to preserve a historic building. Kirk Stenersen stated he wasn't involved in the decision from the ZBA. Jason Paolino said it makes sense that it's a lot of acreage, but it has created two non-conforming lots. Roberta Oeser said that she was at the meeting and the applicant said that his original plan was to tear down the house. But after walking through the house he couldn't believe it inside and thought it would be a shame to tear it down.

Chairman Jonah Ketola opened the hearing to abutters, and the public. There were no questions.

Chairman, Jonah Ketola closed the hearing and read the following recommendations:

I recommend approval of this minor subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Monumentation (iron pins) shall be set at all new lot corners.
- 2) All applicable governmental permits including but not limited to NH State subdivision approval for Lot 74-1 shall be obtained.
- 3) Prior, during and after recording of the decision, the applicant shall be made aware that any conditions placed on this subdivision plan through other governmental or permitting agencies are hereby included in this approval.
- 4) The applicant or applicant's agent shall provide the Planning Office with an electronic copy of all approved plans.

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked for a motion to approve this Minor Subdivision

MOTION:

Jason Paolino motioned to grant approval of this Minor Subdivision for Tax Map 7 Lot 74 as presented with the four aforementioned conditions. Sam Bouchie seconded the motion. **Vote: Yes – 7, No -0, Abstain- 0 Motion is approved.**

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked those who arrived during the previous case to sign-in on the list at the back of the gym and restated how to be acknowledged and recognized to speak.

Chairman Jonah Ketola introduced the next case.

2. **CONSIDERATION OF** an application for a Major Site Plan and Major Subdivision review submitted by Navian Development c/o Elias Parkkonen, 581 New Hampshire Route 119, Rindge, NH 03461. The property is located at Tax Map 4 Lot 23, 581 NH Route 119 in the Residential-Agricultural Zoning District. The applicant is seeking approval for a 30 lot PURD (Planned Unit Residential Development).

Chairman, Jonah Ketola turned the meeting over to Planning Director Kirk Stenersen regarding information to be shared with the board prior to the opening of the hearing. Planning Director Kirk Stenersen shared with the board that his father in-law worked for Navian Development the applicant in the next case to be heard and pointed out that he did not work on the project, doesn't vote on the case and that he did review the application.

Jason Paolino suggested the board be polled regarding Planning Director Kirk Stenersen continuing with the hearing on the application.

MOTION:

Jason Paolino made the motion that Kirk Stenersen should continue as Planning Director on this application, Holly Koski seconded, Vote: Aye – 7, No - 0. Roberta Oeser clarified that the polling requires individual responses. Jonah Ketola called for the polling of the vote: Sam Bouchie - yes, Kim McCummings – yes, Jason Paolino – Yes, Jonah Ketola - Yes, Roberta Oeser – Yes, Holly Koski– Yes, Cheves Walling – Yes, Katelyn Smith – Yes. **All were in favor.**

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked Planning Director, Kirk Stenersen PE to provide the board with an overview of the case.

Background Information:

1. Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC on behalf of Navian Development has submitted for approval of a Planned Unit Residential Development (PURD) – 66 units (26 single family lots, 16 three-bedroom multi-family units in 4 four-unit buildings and 24 two-bedroom multi-family units in 4 six-unit buildings). The applicant is taking advantage of the bonus for Workforce PURD's. Per note 4 on Sheet SP-1 (2 of 30) the applicant is proposing 16 workforce housing units (10 within the multi-family units and 6 within the single family units). The applicant has submitted a major site plan application as well as a major subdivision application in accordance with Section 4 of the PURD regulations.

2. The following waiver has been requested by the applicant:

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

- a. From the Subdivision Regulations Section V. Submission Requirement: 3.B.2 for cross section construction plans. The applicant's engineer argues that this is an antiquated method for calculating cuts and fills. Today computers are used for this process.
3. The following waiver may be needed subject to the Planning Boards' interpretation:
- b. From Section 5.G of the PURD regulation due to portions of the 50 foot required buffer being impacted along Route 119 and along the westerly boundary line, both at the northwest corner of the property.
4. The Board should consider whether this is a development of regional impact due to the number of units proposed.

Planning Director Kirk Stenersen asked if the board wanted him to continue with his entire list of items included in the email to the applicants' engineer. Chairman Jonah Ketola said yes, and that the engineer could go over them.

5. Below are my comments that were e-mailed to the applicant's engineer on June 24, 2020 outlining items that are either missing from the plans and/or application package or that need clarification. Once the items are clarified to the Board's satisfaction the applicant will have provided the Planning Board with the information necessary to make an informed decision on the applications. Kirk Stenersen then referenced the "list" containing the following 33 items.

From the Subdivision Regulations (section reference in parentheses):

1. Zoning District Line (V.1.B.1)
2. Statement of lot compliance (V.1.B.2)
3. State subdivision approval (V.2.B.3) – this can be a condition
4. Proposed street names (V.3.B.1.a)
5. Bench marks (V.3.B.1.f)
6. Timing / schedule for the project (V.3.B.3.f)
7. Planning Board Signature block (V.4) – typically this is on all sheets so that if / when the final plans are signed we know which ones are final.
8. Dead end roads are to end in a cul-de-sac (VI.5.E)

From the Site Plan Regulations (section reference in parentheses):

9. NHDOT Driveway Permit (VI.1.A.8) – this can be a condition
10. Planning Board Signature block (VI.1.B.2) – typically this is on all sheets so that if / when the final plans are signed we know which ones are final.
11. Zoning District Line (VI.1.B.3)
12. Use of abutting properties (VI.1.B.4)
13. Snow storage areas (VI.1.B.9)
14. Septic plans for multi-family (VI.2.A.2)

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

15. Sight distance for access point (VI.2.B.2)
16. Landscaping plan for multi-family (VI.2.B.5)
17. Any proposed signage? (VI.2.B.7)
18. Plans for sewage disposal (VI.2.B.11)
19. Nearest Fire Hydrant or fire pond (VI.2.B.12)
20. Test pit logs (VI.2.B.14)
21. Architectural drawings for multi-family (VI.3.A.2)
22. Alteration of Terrain Permit (VI.3.A.4)
23. Phasing schedule for the project (VI.3.B.3) – needs to meet the Phased Development Ordinance

From the Wetlands Ordinance (section reference in parentheses):

24. The runoff from roadways / driveways through wetlands need to be diverted to 50 feet from wetlands (4.G)
25. A special exception is required for the dredging and filling of wetlands (4.G)

From the PURD Regulations (section reference in parentheses):

26. The 50 buffer zone is to be undeveloped (3.A) – the buffer is impacted in the very northwest corner of the property

General Comments:

27. The storage building would most likely fall under accessory buildings (up to the Planning Boards interpretation) if they are for the tenants only. Will that be the case?
28. What is the outdoor storage area shown on sheet 9?
29. Is a public water supply going to be needed? Specifically on Lot 4-23-2.
30. On sheet 9 there is a label for the 100' wetland septic setback but the line itself appears to be frozen.
31. I am sure the board will consider if the development is a development of regional impact.
32. You have a site specific disturbed soil supplement denominator key but it does not appear that the soils are labeled using this key through sheets 18 & 19?

Storm Water Management Report (I have only very briefly looked at this):

33. The town requires design on the 25-year storm event as well (Appendix A III.1 of the Subdivision Regulations and Section VII.9.D of the Site Plan Regulations)

Chairman Jason Ketola asked the engineer to come forward and discuss the application.

Nathan Chamberlain representing Navian Development presented an overview of the plans for the proposed project.

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

After the applicant presentation Planning Director Kirk Stenersen presented the following information from plan review.

Regarding the Application:

- 1) The proposed project is located in the Residential-Agricultural District on Tax Map 4 Lot 23.
- 2) The subject parcel is 110.00 acres. Based on the PURD regulations the applicant is allowed a maximum of 51 units for a conventional PURD. The applicant has proposed a Workforce PURD which allows for a 30% (15 units) density bonus in units. The applicant has proposed a Workforce PURD of 66 units with 50 standards units and 16 workforce units.
- 3) Public utilities will be required to be extended along the proposed roadways.
- 4) The applicant will need to propose road names for the proposed roadways. The Selectman must approve all road names.
- 5) The applicant has proposed a hammerhead turnaround on one of the dead end roads. Hammerhead turn arounds are not allowed per the Subdivision Regulations. I have spoken with the DPW Director and he is against allowing a waiver to permit a hammerhead turn around.
- 6) The Police Chief has submitted comments via e-mail which is copied here:

“A few of my concerns are obviously increased calls for service for a 66 unit development. This would include during the construction phase of this as we ALWAYS get a ton of noise complaints. While there was an attempt for the noise ordinance to pass this year and it failed, I anticipate it coming back around again next year.

I also somewhat concerned about the potential for traffic accidents depending on how the driveway/entrance is constructed. That is a fast area on 119 and with a grade and curve on either side I just want to make sure that line of sight is taken into consideration.

Is there any calculation to use to figure out if the 66 units were at “full” capacity what the increase in population may be?

Thanks”

Planning Director Kirk Stenersen was able to research and determined based upon 2.5 people per unit.

- 7) The plans have been sent to the Director of Public and Life Safety. I have spoken to him and he is against the hammerhead turnaround. He also wants to see plans for the proposed fire protection water supply for the proposed PURD. He also pointed out the need for a pull off area as described in the subdivision regulations every 1,000 feet for cul-de-sacs over 1,000 feet in length. Allows are for apparatus to back up and turn around

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

- 8) A copy of the plans and drainage report were submitted to the Conservation Commission for review and comment. Below is an e-mail from David Drouin:

“The subject of this application was briefly discussed at our meeting tonight regarding the logistics of reviewing for an opinion to the Planning Board.

The Commission decided to schedule for our next meeting on Monday July 13, 2020 to have the developer or their representative make a presentation to the Commission, with the assumption that there will likely be a site visit at some time between the 13th and our second meeting in July on the 23rd when we will likely render our opinion. This will give us a chance to properly notice and to find a venue that will accommodate the applicant, Commission and the public.

Can you reach out to advise the applicant of this schedule and to confirm their attendance and also to have potential site visit dates, either in the evening or the weekends, that we can discuss on the 13th. Feel free to pass along my email to them if need be.

Also please advise the Planning Board that they will not have an opinion on the 13th but at our earliest convenience after the presentation, site visit and discussion.

Thank you”

- 9) The multifamily structures will need to conform to E-911 numbering. This is coordinated through the public and life safety directory.
- 10) There is no indication on the plans for any proposed signage for the site. If there will be signage it needs to be indicated on the plans.
- 11) It appears that the applicant has met the Common Land and Open Space requirements of the PURD regulations. Calculations proving this are shown on sheet SP-1 (2 of 30) in note number 5.
- 12) The Storm Water Management Report and drainage calculations appear to adequately address both the Site Plan Regulations and Subdivision Regulations in regards to storm water runoff. The applicant’s engineer does need to submit calculations for the 25-year storm event to confirm for that specific storm event.
- 13) The PURD is subject to the Phased Development Ordinance. Based on 66 units and 16% per year for 6 – 7 years the applicant is allowed to construct 10 units for each of the first 6 years and 6 units in the final year.
- 14) A mandatory homeowner’s association will be required.
- 15) The applicant is required to submit an affordable housing restrictive covenant due to taking advantage of the bonus units for a workforce PURD. This will need to be reviewed by Town Counsel at the expense of the applicant.
- 16) The applicant will need to obtain a Special Exception from the Town of Rindge Zoning Board of Adjustment for the wetlands crossings. The storm water flows from the wetlands

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

crossings need to follow section 4.G. of the Wetlands Ordinance and be diverted to 50 feet from the wetlands.

- 17) The applicant will need to obtain NHDES Subdivision approval, NHDES septic system construction approvals for the multi-family buildings, NHDES alteration of terrain approval and possibly NHDES public water supply approval.
- 18) The applicant will need to obtain a NHDOT driveway access permit.
- 19) I strongly recommend that The Planning Board should consider a site walk for this proposed development. Due to its size.

Chairman Jonah Ketola opened the meeting to the Board for their questions for the project engineer.

Questions from the board for the project engineer included:

Roberta Oeser: Asked if occupancy limits for two and three bedroom units would be used so that you don't have more occupants than are projected in the plan, or will you be using a set number of bedrooms? For safety reasons were they based on potential number of occupants or number of bedrooms. Mr Chamberlain responded no, they would be designed based on number of bedrooms as proposed by DES guidelines.

For safety reasons the town requires cul-de-sacs vs hammerhead turnarounds and there is a hammerhead on the plan in the residential area. Mr Chamberlain responded that he also noted the response from Emergency Services and would be looking at that.

Holly Koski: Inquired about the listing of Liberty Utilities for electric and Pioneer Telephone being listed under Utility Contacts on the cover sheet of the submitted plans, because neither service our area. She also mentioned seeing a Hillsboro County reference instead of Cheshire County on one of the plan pages.

Kim McCummings: Asked if the applicant could show where the open spaces were and how they would be accessed? Mr Chamberlain located and described the locations of the planned open spaces and the related access points on the plan. Kim McCummings asked where the wetlands were in relation to the open spaces. Mr Chamberlain asked, is the questions are there wetlands in the open spaces, yes", and the calculation has been done. There's a certain percentage of open spaces that cannot be wet, we far exceed the minimum requirement for that. Kim McCummings said it looks like in some cases the open space is surrounded by wetlands. How can you get to them? I believe there are some paths. "Mr Chamberlain responded yes, there are several wetland areas and you can walk across them, it's not like swamp water. Hydraulically they are classified as wetlands. You might not want to go across them during mud season."

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked if there were any other questions from the board. Jason Paolino asked "with the understanding of the definition of buffer zone that Planning Director Kirk Stenersen PE read does that impact your plans at this point?" Mr. Chamberlain responded "yes, we'll have to make some adjustments. There's still room for interpretation for that.

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

Roberta Oeser questioned whether the application is ready to be accepted as complete. Planning Director Stenersen said once the items in the list are clarified to the boards' satisfaction then it can be considered complete. Timing for regional impact for possibly traffic etc. is also something to consider.

Usually, at this point we would determine if the application was complete. It looks like there are items that need to be completed.

Chairman Jonah Ketola suggested taking time to hear from the public and polled the board members. Sam Bouchie – Yes, Kim McCummings - Yes, Jason Paolino – Yes, Jonah Ketola – Yes, Roberta Oeser – Yes, Holly Koski– Yes, Cheves Walling – Yes, Katelyn Smith - Yes

Kirk suggested the board address the following items before hearing from the public:

Determination of a project of Regional Impact, so that planning staff has time to prepare the notices, to make a decision tonight in section VII of the subdivision regulations

Planning Director Kirk Stenersen went through the list of outstanding items to address which included:

Determination of Regional Impact needs a decision tonight

Hammer-head turn around vs. the cul-de-sac,

Diversion of water 50 feet from wetlands crossing

Needs for fire protection

The buffer thing. -The section in the PURD regulations that engineer Chamberlain read in the PURD Regulations was an oversight. The term was landscape buffer and was changed to buffer zone left in its natural state. And it was not picked-up in the set-backs section.

Holly Koski, asked if the access be moved so that it is not directly across from North St.

Engineer Chamberlain said it was standard DOT practice for diversion of traffic for driveways to either be lined up directly across the road from each other, or have at least a 200ft distance between them so there is no conflict on the road. It's the only place to have it and a driveway already exist for the property on Rt 119 across from North Street.

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked Planning Director Kirk Stenersen for clarification on next steps.

Planning Director Stenersen suggested addressing the Regional Impact question and shared the criteria with the board. Based on the current housing stock there would be a 2.5% - 2.6% increase in housing. Other criteria to be considered included proximity to borders of neighboring communities; transportation networks; anticipated emissions like, light, noise, smoke, odors or particles; proximity to aquifers or service waters that transcend municipal boundaries; shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities. And any industry that deals with hazardous materials, or has the potential for accidents which would require evacuation of large areas. Board members discussed including the surrounding towns of Ashburnham and Winchendon, Massachusetts and Jaffrey and Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire.

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

Vote for the project to be identified as a Project of Regional Impact:

Sam Bouchie – Yes, Kim McCummings - Yes, Jason Paolino – Yes, Roberta Oeser – No, Holly Koski –Yes, Cheves Walling – Yes, Katelyn Smith - Yes **Vote: Yes – 6, NO - 1**

Decision for buffer zone containing a Natural Vegetated State: Sam Bouchie – Yes, Kim McCummings, - Yes, Jason Paolino - Yes, Jonah Ketola – Yes, Roberta Oeser - Yes, Holly Koski - Yes, Cheves Walling - Yes, Katelyn Smith – Yes **Vote: Yes – 7, No - 0**

Waiver to allow hammerhead turn around – Sam Bouchie – No, Kim McCummings - No, Jason Paolino - No, Jonah Ketola– No, Roberta Oeser – No, Holly Koski – No, Cheves Walling – No, Katelyn Smith – No **Vote: Yes – 0, No – 7, Abstain - 0**

Chairman Ketola invited public to address the board

Abutter Comments

Kelly Dowd, Attorney for Matthew and Jennifer Merrill at 80 and 114 Old Ashburnham Road in Rindge, there is also an Aquifer Protection District (APD) in Rindge it looks like the application is in the APD. In the ordinance provisions there are limitations on the amount of impervious surfaces you can put in the APD. Unless they can limit the 25% limitation on the amount of development and don't think they are, I don't think you can count the area as developable area. There are questions about the calculation of the open space.

James Golisano and my father Armondo Golisano we're on Lot 75. There are problems with the water from wetlands, this time of year it can be up to shin deep. Concern with water runoff from the roadways and it effects the quality of water from our well due to increased runoff from the aquifer protection area.

Armondo Golisano - There is a brook that flows into a stream which connects with another stream and flows through straight into Lake Monomonac. The effect that the project will do is to drain right into the stream and into the Lake and affect the quality of water. They did a beautiful job on the project but it's a catastrophe waiting for a place to happen.

Keith Worthley, I don't think we need workhouse housing. Single family homes sure, we don't need apartments in Rindge. Don't think the 66 units with 2.5 people per unit. Don't think the number is right. 66 children we're looking at 1.35 million, who's going to pay the property taxes. We don't know how many phases/years. Single family homes I'm for, apartments no. How far off the road will the apartments be? I don't want the whole project. I live right across the street. What kind of impact will there be on property taxes?

Chairman Jonah Ketola asked how far the buildings would be from Rt 119. Nathan Chamberlain of Navian Development responded 50ft from the property line 100ft from the road. It's in excess of 100ft and there's extensive vegetation for the other buildings.

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

Attorney Kelly Dowd was recognized and added to his previous comment that on Page 3 of 30 of the plan, Note 8 does state that the NW corner of the site lies within the limits of the Aquifer Protection District.

Public Comments

Ray Rodrigues, I've lived in Rindge 16 years. Spoke to maintaining the heritage of the town as a small town. Community is viewed as a good place. I would hate to see this change.

Al Febrve, asked for a copy of the meeting notes. I think we need to look at the assessed valuation from the schools as a result of the project. In this area we only receive about 43 inches of rain a year and what does this do to the watershed because it's going to draw on wells?

Jason Paolino as a point of order asked if the planning board notes could be shared on the Town website.

Steve Johnson, said he was appalled at what is happening to Rindge. We have to stop the mass influx of duplexes to come in. What is the impact of families that want to come in? What are the percentage who are allowed after this percentage comes in. We have to consider fire, the safety of from policing everything that deals with this. I'm not against advancement I'm against condominiums and things like this. Don't know how many are from Rindge. People who moved into the town see this as an infringement on the people in single family homes.

Judy Unger-Clark, we have an overlying vision plan / masterplan for this community. We are not preserving our small town character there is a thing called a Vision here. We are not following our PURD's. Our PURD's are not in alignment with our zoning ordinances. Until we can mesh that and get everything inline we shouldn't be entertaining PURDS's I would like to see a moratorium on this. No more PURD's until we get things aligned in our zoning.

Peggy Rodriguez, I lived in Pelham. It used to look like this. Now there are houses all over the place. Who is the housing for? Will the workforce housing be for people that live here or for people who work in Mass and want to live here?

Applicant Comments

Chairman Jonah Ketola thanked the public for their comments and asked Engineer Chamberlain for any comments. Engineer Chamberlain acknowledged the concerns about drainage, and said he would be happy to speak to individuals about impacts to their property. Regarding comments from the board he said, we will see what we can do to address the concerns that have been raised.

Planning Director Kirk Stenersen asked the Attorney Kelly Dowd for the reference he was referring to regarding clarification about the buffer not being counted towards the open space and common land and requested the reference for it. Attorney responded Page 9 G section 1.

Discussion regarding the date for the continuation of the meeting to consider the application took place the agreed upon continuation date was Tuesday, September 1st .

Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2020
JK, SB, JP, KM, HK, RO, CW, KS

Motion: Roberta Oeser made a motion to continue the meeting to consider the application to September 1, 2020. Holly Koski seconded. **Vote: Yes – 7, No - 0, Abstain – 0.** The meeting is continued to Tuesday, September 1, 2020

Director Report – At least one application has been received. The next planning board meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 4th.

Jason Paolino spoke to the need to form a sub-committee to update the PURD-Ordinance and volunteered to chair the subcommittee. There was a brief conversation about how to coordinate and staff the sub-committee. The intent is to go back to square one, explore the original intent of the ordinance and how workforce housing fits in. Jason Paolino will chair the sub-committee which will begin meeting sometime in September.

Meeting Adjourned 9:20pm

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Mc Cummings
Planning Secretary