TOWN OF TEMPLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE PLANNING BOARD

OCTOBER 18, 2012 FINAL MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

Board members present: Camilla Lockwood, Randy Martin, Ken Sullivan, Allan Pickman, Rose Lowry, and John Kieley

Call to order by Pickman (as Vice Chair) at 7:31 p.m. with a quorum attained. Lowry arrived shortly thereafter and took over chairmanship of the meeting.

<u>Comments</u>: Sullivan asked to be heard on an issue before agenda items were addressed. He reminded the board of a recent lot line merger for his two lots in the Stonegate subdivision. Sullivan stated he objected to certain language contained in the merger document that had been recorded at Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds. He said he would like the language removed and the document re-recorded. Kieley told the board the language indicates no further subdivision of the two merged lots is allowed. Kieley said the Selectmen have been told by town counsel that the Stonegate covenants do not read as the Selectmen had understood. Kieley continued that the covenants in fact say the lots cannot be subdivided beyond the plat that was recorded. Kieley acknowledged it had been his understanding that a lot could not be subdivided, when in actuality lots could not be subdivided beyond what shows on the plat. He stated the Board of Selectmen had been in error, and the Planning Board should correct this. Kieley recommended the board obtain a copy of the covenants and original plat for review. Martin spoke up and said he could add information to the discussion. Lockwood then suggested holding this for discussion at the next meeting and putting it on the agenda, with other board members in agreement. Sullivan passed out copies of the merger document with the language he would like removed being underlined.

<u>Approval of minutes</u>: Lockwood suggested a change to a statement in the 10/3/12 meeting minutes to provide clarification about Agenda 21, and this sentence was amended. Sullivan told the board he wished to have certain language regarding a Right-to-Know issue removed from the minutes, and then offered a replacement paragraph he had written to indicate "what really happened". He stated he would like the disagreement that had taken place (over an email memo he had previously sent out to board members) to be reflected in the minutes. Sullivan then read his text aloud. This was followed by discussion about how to handle this type of situation. Sullivan moved to have his text added as an amendment to the last meeting minutes (10/3/12), but there was no second and no vote taken. Sullivan then moved to have the text included as part of the current meeting's minutes, second by Kieley, and voted by Sullivan and Kieley in the affirmative, with Martin, Pickman, Lockwood and Lowry abstaining. The motion did not pass due to only two board members actually voting.

Move by Pickman to accept the minutes of 10/3/12 with the changes suggested by Lockwood, second by Lockwood, and voted with four in favor, Sullivan opposed, and Kieley abstaining.

<u>Community Planning Grant</u>: Lisa Murphy from Southwest Region Planning Commission (SWRPC) provided copies of a report summarizing the results of the Master Plan survey. There was approximately a 19% return rate on 584 surveys mailed out to residents plus a few gathered at the Harvest Festival. The survey results will be presented at the public forum planned for Nov 7th. Murphy has also completed a regulatory review of the town's Zoning Ordinance and part of the Subdivision Regulations, and said she was impressed that the PB has kept current with updates. She will continue working with the board to make sure language is consistent within the town's land use documents, including the Master Plan. Murphy stated some of the survey responses were consistent with the aims of a Neighborhood-Heritage District. Key points:

- 1) Changes can be made to the existing Village, or new village areas could be created
- 2) A N-H District is less restrictive than a Historic District
- 3) Heritage is defined as what is important to community
- 4) The town decides what areas are affected/exempt
- 5) Farm areas, view-sheds, or corridors can all be considered as a N-H District

TOWN OF TEMPLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE PLANNING BOARD

OCTOBER 18, 2012 FINAL MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

- 6) Defining the entire town as a N-H District could be detrimental
- 7) Large intact parcels of land (i.e. north end of town) eligible to be a N-H District
- 8) Aesthetics can be considered in defining a N-H District
- 9) Town forum will be a good place to ask about keeping Temple "the same" and get feedback

Murphy mentioned the town's Workforce Housing ordinance and asked about the history of getting it passed. This was followed by a discussion about estimation of regional need and contributing a "fair share". Murphy noted Temple Is on the outside edge of regions that need to contribute, as the town is not near a major job area. She also said typically workforce housing would involve multi-family dwellings, and the last survey showed current residents do not want these in the town. Survey results will be available on the town website.

Details for planning and implementation of the forum were designated. Kieley will give an overview and Lowry and Murphy will take turns providing details. The PB meeting will start at 7:00 p.m. on Nov 7th, with the forum to start at 7:30 p.m. Also discussed was making sure of compliance with the goals of the Community Planning Grant. Murphy said she could have a final report available by Oct 26th, and board members then decided to hold a short PB meeting on Monday, Oct 29th at 7:30 p.m. to finalize preparation.

<u>Appointment: George Willard – lot line merger</u>: Willard showed the board a copy of a 1987 subdivision plat for Map 5A Lot 75. The plat illustrated a parent lot of 35+- acres and three 3+- acre residential lots. Willard explained that only one of the residential lots had been sold over the years, and he was considering merging one lot back to the parent lot. This was due to certain characteristics of the land (wetlands) that might affect future access to land development. He also said the parent lot was in Current Use but the smaller residential lots. Willard wanted to know if the two remaining smaller lots could be put into Current Use status as well. After a short review and discussion, Willard was told that since the undeveloped lots were contiguous to the parent lot and under the same ownership, they could indeed be put into Current Use. Willard was advised to contact the Board of Selectmen's office to proceed with this. Willard will hold on the lot line merger for now.

<u>Barnsley project</u>: Kieley reported recent contact the Board of Selectmen had with William Barnsley. Barnsley is proposing a development of Map 5B Lot 91, which consists of approximately 25 acres located near the town line with New Ipswich. The project involves crossing a beaver pond with an access road, then building a large commercial agricultural business to support farming activities such as raising fish, animal husbandry, growing crops, etc. Reference was also made of an intention to provide employment to "returning warriors" (injured service personnel). Kieley said everything is uncertain at this point. Lockwood mentioned Barnsley had been in attendance at the meeting in New Ipswich the evening before, and his name has come up with previous dealings in that town. She also commented she was impressed with the operation of the New Ipswich boards.

<u>Update on New Ipswich subdivision</u>: Lockwood and Pickman reported they had attended the meeting in New Ipswich on October 17th, and the public hearing has been continued until November 28th. Lockwood commented that the developer had not presented any maps for review. Pickman said the NI boards are still dealing with procedural matters. One issue is obtaining an accurate unit count and the need for a yield plan. Another issue is deciding if temporary dead-end roads are acceptable. Pickman said there has been no mention of upgrading the Class VI portion of Stowell Road/ Moran Road. Lockwood said everything is all in New Ipswich at this point, and the plan has a long way to go,

Internet access: Extensive discussion about how to expand broadband internet access throughout the town. Key points:

1) There is a need to have broadband access available throughout the town

TOWN OF TEMPLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE PLANNING BOARD

OCTOBER 18, 2012 FINAL MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

- 2) Portions of Temple have access to cable and there is some fiber optic in the area of Rt. 101
- 3) Lack of access could potentially deter home sales in the community
- 4) Selectmen have as a priority on list of objectives and willing to pursue, will keep PB informed
- 5) Both SWRPC and NH Fast Roads are sources of information and assistance
- 6) Town may be able to apply for federal grant to help develop fiber optics
- 7) State legislation has been passed that stops towns from floating bonds toward this type of project
- 8) Estimated cost for Temple is \$1.2 million
- 9) Could possibly be addressed within the town's Subdivision Regulations and/or Master Plan
- 10) Technology changes rapidly and could affect mandates by town
- 11) Public Utilities Commission (PUC) is aware of coverage gaps but not currently pushing as a priority
- 12) With an "open access based" network anyone could connect, i.e. TDS
- 13) Rindge an example of planning and accomplishment will have fiber optic on every street by next year, with 4 different providers, work with developers to get installed
- 14) Put topic on agenda for future discussion with Lisa Murphy

<u>Forum</u>: The board agreed to send out a postcard mailed on Oct 31st to remind people of the public forum on Nov 7th. Signage will also be displayed to help encourage people to attend.

Move to adjourn by Pickman, second by Lockwood, and so voted at 9:45 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Betsy Perry

Next meeting Monday, October 29, 2012 at 7:30 p.m.

Next regularly scheduled meeting Wednesday, November 7, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.