

Planning Board Meeting Date: July 16th, 2025

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: In-person/Zoom

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

Via Zoom : None

Citizens Mike Ploof (Fieldstone), Sharon Rosenfeilder, John Rosenfeilder, Greg Somero, Diane Knisley, Zach Nuccio, Manny Ceibalo

Citizens Via Zoom: Amanda Gagnion

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

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

- Chair Daley asked Rob Fournier to sit in for Bruce Ruotsala. Rob agreed.
-

2. Review of 7/2/2025 Meeting Minutes

- Correct spelling from “Ringe” to “Rindge”
 - Correct “Smeith” to “Smeeth”
 - Correct “Daly” to “Daley”
 - Josh made a motion to approve the July 2nd minutes as amended.
 - Motion seconded by Craig Smeeth.
 - Vote passes unanimously.
-

3. Chair/Selectmen/Admin Updates

Gravel Pit Complaint Update

- A long-standing complaint regarding a gravel pit has not been discussed by the group in recent meetings.
 - The Planning Board referred the matter to the Select Board for investigation.
 - Peter Kellner has now been hired as the new building inspector, code enforcement, and will also serve in a role with the fire department, fulfilling a previously discussed fire/building inspector/code enforcement combination role.
 - A request was made to ensure the gravel pit investigation is formally followed up on.
-

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Discussion

- A new law allows one detached ADU by right statewide.
 - The town will need to review and update its zoning ordinance to reflect this change.
 - Current ordinances include language around fitting with the "general nature of the neighborhood," which may now be restricted unless universally applied to all structures—not just ADUs.
 - The Board needs to:
 - Review actual legislative language
 - Evaluate dimensional and design standards in the new language (e.g., what limits should apply to detached ADUs)
 - Consider how to handle cases where large ADUs have been allowed, especially on larger parcels
 - Possibly establish maximum square footage limits (e.g., 950 sq. ft.) for by-right ADUs and require special exceptions for larger ones
 - A suggestion was made to coordinate with the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) to clarify whether a second ADU would trigger zoning review.
 - Some discussion around common past ADU designs (e.g., garage additions for elderly family members).
 - The group noted that detached and attached ADUs are assessed and taxed based on total livable space and must include a full kitchen and bath to qualify as ADUs.
-

Next Steps for ADU Regulation Review

- A handout on legislative changes was provided for circulation.
 - The Planning Board will likely meet with the ZBA in early August to discuss how the new ADU rules impact local zoning.
 - Changes to local zoning ordinances cannot be formally adopted until Town Meeting in March, but draft language will be prepared in the meantime to help guide interim decisions.
-

Emergency Preparedness Project

- SWRPC will assist the Town in updating its emergency preparedness plan, which is expected to run from now through Thanksgiving.
 - The Board needs a representative to participate alongside the Fire Chief and Emergency Management Director.
 - Due to other upcoming responsibilities—such as the Capital Improvement Plan, zoning amendments, and budget preparation—Board members were asked to consider volunteering to help "divide and conquer."
-

Decision Letter Process

- Dee sent the Ray Aho S25-1 draft decision letter from the last meeting to Aaron and Josh for review.
 - Some feedback had been received already, and Board members were encouraged to review the letter so it could be sent out the next day.
-

4. 7:16 PM. #L25-1 Greg Somero Map 8 Lots 100 & 100-1. 63 & 55 Taylor Road.

- **Presenter:** Mike Ploof, Fieldstone Land Consultants (Land Surveyor)
- **Owners:** Greg and Sharon Somero
- **Subject Lots:**
 - Lot 8-100 (63 Taylor Road): ~26.00 acres; ~735 ft frontage
 - Lot 8-100-1 (55 Taylor Road): 2.57 acres; 200 ft frontage
- **Project Description:**
 - Lot line adjustment only (not a subdivision)
 - Revises the common boundary between two existing lots
- **Parcel Exchanges:**
 - **Parcel A:** Transfers from Lot 8-100-1 to Lot 8-100 to expand backyard behind riding arena
 - **Parcel B:** Transfers from Lot 8-100 to Lot 8-100-1 to include existing garages closer to the 55 Taylor Road residence
- **Post-Adjustment Areas & Frontage:**
 - Lot 8-100: ~26.70 acres; ~655 ft frontage
 - Lot 8-100-1: 2.00 acres; 280 ft frontage
- **Zoning & Dimensional Compliance:**
 - **District:** Rural
 - **Requirements:**
 - Minimum 2 acre lot size
 - Minimum 200 ft frontage
 - Setbacks: 30 ft front; 20 ft sides/rear
 - **Non-Conformity:** Pre-existing front setback encroachment by the residence on Lot 8-100-1 (unchanged by adjustment)

- **Waiver Requests:**

- Six waivers submitted for plan detail and procedural requirements as noted by the peer-review engineer
-

2. WAIVERS REQUESTED & APPROVED (6 Total)

1. Article 1, Section 1 Checklist #10 – Boundary Lines, Bearings & Distances

- Omitted full delineation of Lot 100's southern portion (across Taylor Rd).
- Rationale: That area is unrelated to the adjustment and surveying it would be unnecessary and costly.

2. Article 1, Section 13 Checklist #14 – Conditions on Adjacent Land (within 25 feet)

- Did not show structures and uses on adjacent parcels outside the area of interest.
- Rationale: No impact on neighboring properties; visual context irrelevant to minor adjustment.

3. Article 1, Section 5 Checklist #18 – Topography

- Contour lines and elevation data omitted from unaltered portions of Lot 100.
- Rationale: No construction is proposed; topography in adjusted areas was included.

4. Article 1, Section 6 Checklist #19 – Geographic Features

- Omitted mapping of stone walls, water features, etc., on unused land.
- Rationale: No physical or environmental change proposed.

5. Article 1, Section 17 Checklist #17 – One Contiguous Acre of Non-Wet, Non-Steep Slopes

- Waiver requested, though not strictly needed. CHA originally assumed the site was in the conservation overlay.
- Rationale: Both lots are already developed, compliant, and the boundary changes are outside the overlay.

6. Checklist Item #25 – Existing and Proposed Well Locations

- Only known wells identified; no wells or well radii are within 25 feet of affected parcels.
 - Rationale: Locating all potential wells on 26+ acres is cost prohibitive and irrelevant.
-

3. APPLICATION COMPLETENESS

- With waivers granted, the application was declared complete.
- All checklist items were reviewed and accounted for.
- Josh made a motion to approve all 6 waivers. Motion seconded by Graham. Motion passed 5-0, with 2 absentions (Lou and Craig)

7:51 PM – Motion to Accept the Application as Complete

- Josh made a motion to accept the application as complete.
 - Seconded by Graham
 - Motion passed unanimously. Lou and Craig abstained.
-

4. DESIGN/COMPLIANCE

- The Planning Board Engineer noted several reviews of application materials and found the application was generally compliant, with concerns about setback deficits, need for easement/shared driveway access

5. DISCUSSION ON EASEMENTS

Access Easement (Shared Driveway)

- The existing driveway from Lot 100-1 to Lot 100 (serves riding arena) is proposed to be formalized and widened via easement.
- Previously narrow; now expanded to allow large vehicle access (e.g., hay delivery).
- Defined as “Access Easement C011” and labeled on plan as “polka dot” area.

Utility Easement

- A new 10-ft wide easement (5’ each side) granted over Lot 100 for utility lines serving 100-1.
- Denoted as “cross-hatch” area.

State DES Easement

- NH Department of Environmental Services holds easement rights to access and maintain a flood control dam and outflow structure located at the northern portion of Lot 100.
- Labeled and referenced in Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds (Book 1798, Page 15).

Board Concerns

- Board raised concerns over the access easement’s future use potential:
 - Could it serve more than one dwelling if Lot 100 were ever subdivided?

- Should the easement be explicitly limited to existing use or single-lot access?
 - Given the recent property sale to the Schusters (Lot 100-1) midway through the application/hearings, the board questioned whether they fully understood the legal and future implications of the easement.
 - Draft deeds and easements were submitted but had not yet been reviewed by the Town Attorney. The applicant's engineer notes the drafts will need to be updated based on the Shcuster's information etc. The drafts will be resubmitted prior to attorney review.
-

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Greg Somero spoke.
 - Confirming that adding the garage to the parcel and giving more pasture land to the riding area makes logical sense. The current lot line is quite close to the barn.
 - Amanda inquired if horses would remain. Response: no definitive plan; owner undecided.
 - Motion made by Josh to close Public Comment and was seconded by Graham.
 - Vote passes unanimously.
-

6. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- Josh makes a motion to approve the lot line adjustment application for Greg Somero, regarding Map 8, Lots 100 and 100-1, located on Taylor Road, with the following conditions:
 1. Updated Mylars and All Applicable Fees must be submitted.
 2. Revised Deeds and Easements (reflecting new lot lines and ownership) must be filed within six months.
 - 3. Town Attorney Review and Approval of:
 - The shared driveway and access easement. (Attorney to specifically verify that easement scope is clear to both parties.)
 - The utility easement
 -
 - Lou seconded and vote passed unanimously.
 - Dee makes a motion to continue until Aug 20th at 7:10 PM if needed (in the event that the attorney does not approve the easements without stipulations).
 - Seconded by the Board and passed unanimously.
-

7. CONCEPTUAL MEETING: Manuel Caiado, Map 8 Lot 11A, Taylor Road.

Applicant & Project Overview

- **Applicant:** Manuel Caiado (owner of MC Specialty)
 - **Current Business:** Operates a one-person machine shop with occasional help from his father (semi-retired).
 - **Current Location:** Massachusetts; seeks to relocate the business to New Ipswich to avoid long commutes.
 - **Property Address:** Owns a home on Map 8, Lot 11A directly across from the Flower Farm on Taylor Road.
 - **Proposal:** Build a small detached workshop on the property to operate the business from home.
-

Application Status

- Application received was incomplete (only cover page submitted).
 - Mr. Caiado was invited to the meeting to discuss the concept and understand requirements.
 - Engineering plans were expected from Fieldstone Land Consultants, but they are not ready yet.
 - Board provided guidance on completing the application and checklist, and that the engineer will be able to help the applicant complete the application form. .
-

Zoning Status

- Mr. Caiado previously appeared before the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA).
 - ZBA approved the use under home occupation provisions, given he owns and resides on the property.
 - ZBA may have set conditions (e.g., hours of operation), but none were recalled during this meeting.
-

Site Details

- Parcel is triangular, with an existing home and garage.
- Proposed shop location: Behind the house, near the rear of the property—intended for the entrance/front of the shop to face away from abutting homes.
- Plan to use the existing driveway for access to the new structure; no new curb cut planned.
- Board confirmed this approach would generally be preferable to avoid adding new driveway entrances.

Proposed Building

- Originally proposed: 30x40 ft building.
- Currently considering downsizing to a 20x30 ft structure, given it's a one-person operation.

Operations & Environmental Considerations

- **Noise:**
 - Minimal anticipated; machines produce only a low humming sound.
 - Applicant stated noise should not be audible from outside the building.
- **Hours of Operation:**
 - Generally works 7 AM to 3 PM, or 7 AM to 5 PM during summer.
 - Willing to accept restrictions on hours if required.
- **Chemicals/Fluids:**
 - Uses biodegradable, water-soluble coolant and small quantities (gallon jugs) of circulating oil.
 - No hazardous storage beyond a few 5-gallon containers.
 - No 55-gallon drums or flood coolant expected.
- **Lighting:**
 - Will be directed away from abutters and toward the home/trees.
 - Aware of ordinance preventing light spillage over property lines.

Board Feedback and Guidance

- **Checklist Items to Address in Full Application:**
 - Site plan showing house, well, septic, existing structures, and proposed shop location.
 - Drainage plan (particularly due to sloping land) with attention to any grade changes moving from the driveway to the new building.
 - Snow storage location (now required for commercial use).
 - Parking and circulation plan (for any employee/customer vehicles).
 - Soil types and any wetland considerations.
 - Identification of hazardous materials, if any.
 - Reviewed abutter notification (strongly emphasized).
 - Noted that the abutters are supportive, including the flower farm owner who had spoken positively at the ZBA meeting.
 -
- **Discussion/Additional Tips:**
 - Be proactive about noise, lighting, and spill control.

- Consider having drainage intercepts (e.g., oil separator/grease trap) if installing a floor drain.
 - Work with Fieldstone to complete and submit a formal application.
 - Board members were familiar with the site.
 -
-
-

Next Steps

- Manuel to:
 - Follow up with Fieldstone Land Consultants for engineering plans.
 - Complete the application and checklist with their assistance.
 - Return for formal site plan review once materials are submitted.
 - Planning Board will:
 - Review a full application once submitted.
 - Likely consider noise, traffic, hours, fluids, and lighting in detail during formal hearing.
-

8. CONCEPTUAL PLAN AND CHANGES

The Planning Board held a working session to review and revise proposed amendments to the Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations concerning conceptual consultations. The purpose was to finalize draft language in preparation for a public hearing and potential adoption.

Key Topics Discussed

1. Conceptual Consultations – Applicability and Requirements

- The Board reviewed draft language titled "Conceptual Plan Amendments", which proposes:
 - Making conceptual consultations mandatory for subdivision applications.
 - Making conceptual consultations optional for lot line adjustments.
 - It was agreed that applicants should be encouraged to meet with the Board early in the process, especially for complex subdivisions
-
-

2. Lot Line Adjustments

- The Board discussed whether to require conceptual consultations for lot line adjustments.

- Consensus: These consultations should be optional due to limited benefit in early-stage discussion without detailed plans.
 - Proposed language to clarify: *“Preliminary conceptual consultation is not mandatory for lot line adjustments”*
-

3. Process Adjustments

- Existing language under Procedures was revised to reflect:
 - Mandatory consultation for subdivisions.
 - Optional consultation for lot line adjustments.
-

4. Clarification of Representation

- Revised language permits either the applicant or their engineer to attend conceptual consultations.
 - Language such as *“An engineer may attend and participate in the conceptual consultation”* was adopted.
 - The Board emphasized the desirability (though not requirement) of the applicant being present.
-

5. Submission Requirements for Conceptual Consultation

- Applicants must submit materials at least one week prior to the meeting, including:
 - Name and contact information.
 - Project description.
 - Map and lot number.
 - The Board agreed that publicly available GIS and tax map data can be used during consultation in lieu of requiring applicants to supply detailed mapping (since the goal is to make the conceptual review as minimally burdensome as possible).
-

6. Language Format and Accessibility

- Draft formatting:
 - **Underlined** = new or relocated language.
 - **Bold** = significant additions.
 - **Strikethrough** = deletions.
- The Board agreed to retain statutory references (e.g., RSA 676:4, II) but place them in parentheses to reduce confusion.

- Purpose: Ensure clarity for applicants without compromising legal protections.
-

7. Revisions to Site Plan Review Regulations

- To maintain consistency, the Site Plan Regulations were revised to:
 - Reference the new Subdivision Regulation procedure for conceptual consultations.
 - Require site plan applicants to engage in conceptual consultations using the same standards.
 - The phrase “*The board recognizes the desirability...*” was moved to the beginning of the site plan section to align procedural expectations.
-

Next Meeting Agenda Preview

The following topics are expected to be included in the next meeting’s agenda:

- Public Hearing on Conceptual Plan Amendments (post updated language in office, do a public push notice, website posting and post meeting notice).
 - Review of Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) regulatory updates (post-legislation).
 - Revisit of Cluster Development and Soil-Based Lot Sizing amendments.
-

8. 9:38 PM Motion to Adjourn

Criag makes a motion to adjourn, seconded by the Board and vote passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Steven Satterfield