

Planning Board Meeting Date: May 21, 2025

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: In-person/Zoom

Attendees In-person: Dee Daley (Chair), Josh Muhonen (Vice Chair), Lou Alvarez (Ex-Officio) Bruce Ruotsala, Graham Heagy, Craig Smeeth, Aaron Bertram, Robert Fournier, Steven Satterfield

Via Zoom : None

Citizens Dan Barowski, Ray Aho, Anthony Aho

Citizens Via Zoom: None

7:00 P.M. Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call:

- Meeting called to order by Chair Dee Daley. Pledge of Allegiance recited.

Approval of Minutes:

- April 16th, 2025, meeting minutes reviewed
 - Correction to date of the meeting from March 6th to “April 16th”
- Motion to approve minutes as amended made by Josh Muhonen, seconded by Craig Smeeth.
- Vote: All in favor, Motion carried with unanimous decision.

7:10 P.M. Board discussed Tuttle Gravel Pit complaint from the previous meeting.

- The Board briefly discussed an unresolved complaint regarding the Tuttle Gravel Pit. Lou Alvarez was previously tasked with bringing the issue to the Select Board and providing updates, but no new information has been shared yet. Dee Daley mentioned hearing construction noises, possibly related to the pit cleanup work that was supposed to happen in the summer. There was also a concern about increased access to the site by others. It was suggested that someone should go inspect the area. The pit is located off Ashburnham Road, but the specific address wasn't known.

7:20 PM. Subdivision Application S25-1 Ray Aho (Turnpike Road) 2 lot subdivision

Continued from 4/16/25, and 5/7/25

Dan Barowski from Fieldstone provided a brief update on the Ray Ajo 2-lot subdivision on Turnpike Road. Since the last meeting, the main change has been a modification to one of the driveways, it was shortened and relocated roughly 50 feet due to the septic design, now sitting about 75 feet from the road and a stone wall. Septic designs and erosion control plans for both lots have been submitted as well as a copy of the state driveway permit, additional topographical information from the prior subdivision, and responses to the first engineering review from CHA. Dan is awaiting feedback from both CHA and Peter Somero regarding the revised driveway

location. He noted prior confusion about lot frontage may have been one of the reasons the application to initially be considered incomplete.

1. Board Discussion: Submission Process & Completeness

1. Procedural Expectations

- Materials must arrive at least one week prior to meeting (by 11:30 AM), including engineering reviews and responses.
- Future submissions: send to Steven, CC: CHA engineer, to streamline process.

2. Completeness Threshold

- Items were submitted past the deadline without time for engineering review
 - Goal is to determine completeness to allow compliance review, not to act as the board's own engineer.
 - Board consensus: proceed through the completeness checklist to establish if enough information exists for a "cognizant dialogue."
-

2. Outstanding Completeness Checklist Review (Items 1–26)

No.	Item	Status / Response
1	NH DOT driveway permit	Submitted; one driveway approved; embedded in CHA submission.
2	State septic approval (sheets 5–6)	Provided.
3	Steep slopes overlay	Resubmitted with larger context plan.
4	Fire chief letter	Original request sent; new letter received today indicating need for water supply discussion.
5	Proposed septic plans	Submitted.
6	State subdivision approval	Pending ; applicant explained policy of post-completeness filing to avoid multiple \$300 resubmissions.
7	Utility notification letters	Copy of public utility notice provided.
8	Cable provider notice	Submitted.
9–10	Steep slopes & conservation overlay commentary	Addressed via submission of topographic and sediment/erosion control plans.
11	Frontage (lots & driveway access)	Frontage adequate; waiver needed for driveway access via Class 6 road (Old Rindge).
12	NH DOT review (existing on prior subdivision access)	Already approved under prior subdivision for two access points (one of the driveways is part of this subdivision).

No.	Item	Status / Response
13–14	Drainage & erosion control	New plans submitted (erosion control sheets 4 & 5 in packet).
15	“Scattered & premature” (Class 6 roads)	Fire chief letter acknowledges water source issue; material provided for discussion.
16	Waivers required (see below)	Waivers for state subdivision approval & existing conditions plan submitted.
17	Slopes addressed in septic plans	Confirmed.
18	Perc tests/percolation rates	Added to septic plan.
19	Curb cuts	Included in updated plans.
20	Driveway widths & grades	Shown on septic & erosion control detail sheets.
21	Erosion control measures	Included in latest submission.
22	No changes to lot lines	Statement provided.
23	Site distance (DPW letter)	Email from Peter Somero confirming adequate sight distance; to be located in record.
24	Contour corrections & topo notation	Addressed in topographic plan.
25	Standalone existing conditions plan (waiver)	Waiver filed (Appendix A)—topographic plan shows both existing & proposed features.
26	Other outstanding commentary	Addressed via supplemental materials from prior subdivision package.

3. Waiver Requests & Board Actions

1. 7:43 P.M. State Subdivision Approval Waiver

- **Rationale:** Financial hardship & timing; state approval to be obtained before final plan.
- **Motion made by Josh Muhonen:** Accept waiver for state subdivision approval.
- **Seconded by:** Bruce Ruotsala
- **Vote:** Passed unanimously in favor.

2. 7:45 P.M. Existing Conditions Plan Waiver

- **Rationale:** Topographic plan already illustrates existing features; separation of proposed lines is clear.
 - **Discussion:** Board requested that limits of clearing be explicitly shown on plan. Applicant agreed.
 - **Motion made by Josh Muhonen:** Accept waiver for standalone existing conditions plan.
 - **Seconded by:** Bruce Ruotsala
 - **Vote:** Passed unanimously in favor.
-

4. Determination of Completeness

- **7:48 PM -Motion made by Dee Daley:** Application deemed complete for purposes of compliance review.
 - **Seconded by:** Bruce Ruotsala
 - **Vote:** Passed unanimously in favor.
-

5. Public Comment

- **7:50 P.M.** Chair Dee Daley invited public comment.

Fire Chief's Water-Source Letter (Benjamin Hatcher)

- **Content of Letter:**
 - No known on-site water source for firefighting on the subject property.
 - As a major subdivision, a dedicated water supply is required.
- **Board Questions:**
 - Clarify whether Chief Hatcher if the water source letter references the entire prior five-lot subdivision or only the current two-lot proposal.
 - Determine nearest existing public water sources or standpipes along/near Old Rindge Road.
 - Need to understand if the fire equip can navigate the turn onto Old Rindge Rd.
 - Research is needed on available hydrants, fire ponds (e.g., at Hutter Road), or natural water bodies.
- **Lot Numbering**
 - Discussion of Tax Map 7-1 lot numbers:
 - Original parent lot "7-1" subdivided into 7-1-2 through 7-1-6; no parcel presently retains the plain "7-1" designation which is best practice according to the Board of Assessors
 - Board of Assessors also reached out to Fieldstone and instructed that for this two-lot application the parent lot (house parcel) revert to 7-1-5 and the new lot become 7-1-7.
 - Importance of preserving the original lot number for parent parcels emphasized to avoid GIS/Avitar confusion. (BoA educated PB of conventional numbering schema).

"Scattered & Premature" & Class VI Road Access Discussion

- **Scattered & Premature Consideration:**
 - Board noted this proposal is on an existing stretch of Old Rindge Road.
 - Discussion whether lack of contiguous services (water, fire) triggers the criterion.
- **Class VI Road Maintenance & Access:**

- State and local regulations require those with frontage on a Class VI road to maintain it and it is required that they obtain Selectmen's permission before any upgrades or modifications.
- Anecdotal report: recent unpermitted improvements were made on Old Rindge Road without Selectmen's approval,
- **State Safety Concerns**
 - Lou noted the Town received a letter from the State about safety concerns (e.g., intersection sight distance of Old Rindge and NH Rte. 123/124).
 - Will request letter from the Town Administrator
- **Proposed Condition:**
 - Board consensus to require, as a condition of compliance, a formal maintenance agreement approved by the Selectmen for any work or access on Old Rindge Road.

Engineering Feedback & Next Steps

- Applicant to reframe response packet for CHA: separate new responses vs. prior subdivision materials that contain details requested by CHA.
- Applicant to coordinate with fire chief on nearest water source mapping and potential recharge solutions (e.g., culvert recharge).
- Fieldstone to add "limits of clearing" note to plan.
- CHA review expected by next meeting.

Motion to Continue

- **8:27 P.M. -Motion made by Josh Muhonen:** To continue S25-1 Ray Aho (Turnpike Road) 2 lot subdivision to June 4th at 7:20 P.M.
 - **Seconded by:** Bruce Ruotsala
 - **Vote:** Passed unanimously in favor
-

6. Selectmen's, Chair, Admin Report

A. Equipment Delivery:

- New dump truck and used F-350 acquired for ~\$45,000.
- Town-wide memo & photo of the dump truck circulated.

B. Legislative Update:

- Met with state representatives; potential zoning mandates for one-acre lots statewide.
- Discussion on impacts for towns without municipal sewer or water.

C. Master Plan Work Group Update

Public Safety Focus Group:

First stakeholder interview conducted with Police, Fire, and EMS leadership (excluding Emergency Management Director Eric Maxwell).

- Key themes: radio communications, equipment, infrastructure—broad agreement among participants.
- Draft notes and summary to be prepared within one week; data submitted to SWRPC for Master Plan integration.

D. Documentation of Work Sessions:

- Board clarified that internal focus-group interviews are “work sessions” (not formal hearings) and may be summarized in an internal report to SWRPC rather than full public minutes.

7. Video Recording of Meetings (Roundtable Discussion)**A. Proposal:**

- There is an opportunity to consider filming and achieving Planning Board meetings (own YouTube channel or town’s Community Access).

B. Pros & Cons:

- **Pros:** Increased transparency; public access beyond Zoom; outreach to those unable to attend live.
- **Cons:** Potential procedural scrutiny in litigation; inconsistent coverage across boards; demands on video team; risk of sensationalizing routine discussions.

C. Key Points Raised:

- Minutes remain the official record; recordings typically destroyed after minutes approval to avoid dual “truths.”
- If adopted, recordings could be time-limited (e.g., removed after one month)?
- Would there be consistency across boards to avoid singling out Planning Board.

D. Next Steps:

- Table the issue for further research (RSA requirements, Selectmen’s practices).
- Board members to reflect on pros/cons; revisit at a future meeting.

8. Conceptual and Design Plans as part of the Application Process (Roundtable Discussion)**Conceptual and Design Phase**

- Emphasis was placed on the importance of a conceptual phase before applicants spend money on engineers.
- Conceptual plans should allow meaningful discussion without requiring formal materials or vesting.

- The design phase follows conceptual review and is when vesting occurs—locking in development rights. Historically, this phase was removed as an option in New Ipswich due to extended delays once the potential vesting of the plan elements were in place.
- Other towns are requiring a conceptual phase to help applicants avoid missteps and added costs.
- In New Ipswich, the boundaries of the conceptual phase are currently vague; there's interest in clarifying what applicants can and should bring (e.g., sketches, not formal plans).
- A checklist or guidance document for conceptual review was proposed to ensure consistent and helpful feedback (e.g., slopes, traffic, water, HOA, regional impact).

Issues Identified from Past Projects

- Examples like Brookhaven showed that earlier conceptual input could have avoided later complications.
- There's been frustration over applicants submitting plans only to be met with feedback that could have been given sooner.

Suggestions for Improvement

- Develop a checklist for conceptual reviews: slope, access, utilities, fire ponds, buffers, traffic, etc.
- Encourage applicants to share intentions (e.g., family compound vs. subdivision) early on.
- Provide early feedback on potential red flags—such as steep slopes or infrastructure concerns.
- Consider requiring a sketch or simple layout to facilitate meaningful conceptual discussion without full engineering.
- Aim to provide enough guidance so applicants don't waste time or money unnecessarily.

Other Planning and Zoning Ideas

- Board members voiced an interest in exploring mixed-use development, combining commercial and residential uses.
- Revisit to allow for:
 - Multifamily housing on a single lot
 - Soil-based sizing to determine lot capacity
- Consider future regulations requiring affordable housing units in larger subdivisions (e.g., 2 out of 10 lots).

Procedural Next Steps:

- Conceptual language likely requires 2 meetings to finalize, followed by public hearings to amend subdivision regulations.
- No Town Meeting vote needed, but changes must be properly posted and noticed.
- Priority will be to finish application updates and then revisit zoning.

9:17 P.M. Adjournment of Meeting.

Motion made to adjourn by: Bruce Ruotsala

Seconded by: Josh Muhonen

Vote: Passed with unanimous decision.

Respectfully Submitted,
Steven Satterfield

TOWN OF NEW IPSWICH

661 Turnpike Rd New Ipswich NH 03071

Board of Assessors



May 8, 2025

TO: Planning Board
FROM: Board of Assessors
RE: Numbering of New Lots

Dear Planning Board,

It has come to the attention of the Board of Assessors that lots being created by approved subdivisions are not being numbered correctly. Proper lot numbering is a crucial part of ensuring clarity in development records and maintaining consistency with the town's overall parcel mapping system.

The numbering of lots should be as follows: when a lot is being subdivided it keeps its lot number and the new lots are numbered sequentially. For example, if lot 10/6 was being divided into three lots, the initial lot, in this case lot 10/6, would remain as lot 10/6 and the subdivided lots would be 10/6-1 and 10/6-2. In some of the subdivisions from last year this was not followed, which potentially could lead to confusion for property owners, developers and municipal departments.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please feel free to contact the Board of Assessors with any questions for further clarification. Also, our office would be pleased to assist applicants with the lot numbering prior to their meeting with the Planning Board

Sincerely,

Board of Assessors



New Ipswich Fire Department

Physical: 490 Turnpike Road
Mailing: 661 Turnpike Road
New Ipswich, NH 03071
Tel: (603) 878-1364

Chief Benjamin Hatcher
Assistant Chief Cody Vaillancourt Deputy Chief Gary Somero

RECEIVED

MAY 21 2025

Per



Town of New Ipswich Planning Board
c/o Steven Satterfield
661 Turnpike Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

To Steven Satterfield.

In response to the letter that was sent from Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC, there is no sufficient water source on the property that the New Ipswich Fire Department is aware of. In reviewing the plans there is nothing showing a water source from the property owner. Given this is considered a major subdivision a water source will be needed for this project. Please let me know if you need anything further.

Respectfully,

Benjamin Hatcher
Fire Chief