

**TOWN OF THORNTON
PLANNING BOARD**

Approved on: Feb 16, 2023
PB Initials: WJ/NB
Rec'd by Town Clerk on: 2/21/23
Town Clerk Initials: ACR

**Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Thursday, December 15, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Chairman Nancy Decoteau called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Members present at Town Hall: Nancy Decoteau, Chairman; Steven Babin, Vice-Chairman (via Zoom); Frank Freeman; Peter Laufenberg; Donna O'Donnell; Cynthia Schofield; Kathy Menici, Planning Director; Kerrin Randall, Board Assistant

Members not present: David Rivers

Alternates present at Town Hall: Jack Gaites

Others present via call-in (partial names are as they appeared via Zoom): Joe Peznola, Scott, Galaxy S9, Shawn Magoon, Google Pixel 5

Others present at Town Hall: Tom Duffield, Joe Peznola, Kevin McKenna, Jason Bergeron, Myrtle Lewis, Kevin Leonard, Mark Fischler, Jon Bownes, Corey Swartz

Ms. Decoteau asked Mr. Babin if he would be participating as a voting member, as he was joining via Zoom. Mr. Babin stated yes, and Ms. Decoteau stated that all votes shall be roll call votes. Ms. Decoteau sat Mr. Gaites in place of Mr. Rivers.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Upon distribution and review of the meeting minutes of November 17, 2022, the members took the following action:

MOTION: "To accept and approve the Minutes of the Thursday, November 17, 2022 meeting as amended."

Motion: N. Decoteau

Second: D. O'Donnell

Discussion: None

Roll Call Vote: N. Decoteau – yes, S. Babin – yes, F. Freeman – yes, P. Laufenberg – yes, D. O'Donnell – yes, Cynthia Schofield – yes, J. Gaites – yes

Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN

Motion passes.

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. ZBA Notice of Decision – FYI

Ms. Decoteau commented that the ZBA extended approval of the Vertex Tower Assets waiver and variance. Mr. Freeman stated that the application was approved by the Planning Board, and was not aware that the ZBA could extend it. Planner Menici clarified the extension was for waivers and variances granted by the ZBA only; should they not be exercised within two (2) years of approval, they expire without a request to extend.

Mr. Freeman asked how long a site plan approval remains valid and Planner Menici stated she will research and update the Board.

2. Correction to White Mountain Escapes, LLC Road Bond Release Request – 11/17/2022
Ms. Decoteau stated the amount of the original road bond for partial release for Jack's Run was incorrect on the notice of decision, and an amendment needs to be made.

**MOTION: "To amend the notice of decision for White Mountain Escapes to read:
To grant the partial bond release for Jack's Run from \$275,000.00 to \$42,500.00."**

Motion: N. Decoteau

Second: D. O'Donnell

Discussion: None

Roll Call Vote: N. Decoteau – yes, S. Babin – yes, F. Freeman – yes, P. Laufenberg – yes, D. O'Donnell – yes, Cynthia Schofield – yes, J. Gaites – yes

Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN

Motion passes.

Ms. Decoteau stated the Planning Board has been invited to Donny Howe's retirement lunch on Monday, December 19, 2022 at the Town Hall from 1:00 p.m. until 3:00 p.m. She stated Donny is retiring after 28 years at the Transfer Station.

HEARINGS:

1. PUBLIC HEARING – 2023 Proposed Zoning Amendments

Ms. Decoteau stated this is the first public hearing for the proposed Zoning Amendments for 2023, and opened the public hearing at 6:10 p.m. Copies of the proposed amendments have been posted on the town website, and printed copies available at Town Hall.

Ms. Decoteau reviewed proposed amendments:

Zoning Amendment #1

Are you in favor of the adoption of amendments to the existing Town of Thornton Zoning Ordinance Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance, as proposed by the Town of Thornton Planning Board, as follows:

Add a new Section 1. Authority which alters the sequential numbering of subsequent Articles and adds the following language:

This ordinance is adopted pursuant to RSA 674:21. The Town of Thornton Planning Board is vested with the authority to administer this ordinance, and may grant conditional use permits, or waiver provisions of this ordinance to allow the site of wireless telecommunications facilities.

Amend newly numbered Section 4. Applicability, Paragraph A to read:

In addition to compliance with this Ordinance, all applications are subject to Site Plan Review by the Thornton Planning Board in accordance with the Thornton Site Plan Review Regulations and are subject to approval by the Thornton Board of Selectmen.

Amend newly numbered Section 4. Applicability, to delete Paragraph B.

~~B. All requests for a variance must be before the Zoning Board of Adjustment.~~

Amend the first sentence of the newly numbered Section 6. Use Regulations, introductory paragraph to read:

All wireless telecommunications facilities shall, in all cases, require a zoning compliance certificate issued by the Board of Selectmen and may be permitted as follows:

Amend the newly numbered Section 6. Use Regulations, Paragraph A. Existing Tower Structures: as follows:

Change reference from building permit to zoning compliance certificate.

Change reference from Section 6 to Section 8.

109 Amend newly numbered Section 6. Use Regulations, Paragraph C. to change the reference from
110 Section 6.C. to Section 8.C.

111
112 Amend newly numbered Section 6. Use Regulations, Paragraph D. to read as follows:

113 D. Ground-Mounted Facility: A wireless telecommunications facility involving construction of a
114 ground mount shall require Site Plan Review and require a conditional use permit pursuant
115 to the provisions of this Ordinance.

116
117 Amend newly numbered Section 9. Monitoring and Maintenance, Paragraph B. to change reference
118 from building permit to zoning compliance certificate.

119
120 Amend newly numbered Section 11. Application Procedure, Paragraph A. to read:

121 A. An applicant for a telecommunications tower must apply for a conditional use permit
122 pursuant to the terms of this ordinance and for site plan review. If approved, the Planning
123 Board will make recommendations to the Board of Selectmen to issue a zoning compliance
124 certificate.

125
126 Amend the first sentence of the newly numbered Section 11. Application Procedure, Paragraph C. to
127 read:

128 C. If the applicant is proposing to build a tower or other ground-mounted structure, the
129 applicant shall submit written evidence demonstrating why no existing structure can
130 accommodate the applicant's proposed facility.

131
132 Amend newly numbered Section 12. Waivers, Paragraph A. to read:

133 A. Where the Planning Board finds that extraordinary hardships, practical difficulties, or
134 unnecessary and unreasonable expense would result from strict compliance with the terms
135 of this Ordinance, or the purpose of these regulations may be served to a greater extent by
136 an alternative proposal, it may approve waivers to the regulations. The Planning Board shall
137 not approve any waiver(s) unless a majority of those present and voting shall find that all of
138 the following apply:

139
140 Amend newly numbered Section 12. Waivers, Paragraphs B. and C.:

141 Replace all references to Zoning Board of Adjustment with Planning Board.

142
143 Amend newly numbered Section 15. Savings Clause to read:

144 If any provision of this Ordinance is found to be unenforceable or unlawful by a Court of
145 competent jurisdiction, such finding shall not be construed to invalidate the remainder of the
146 Ordinance.

147
148 **Zoning Amendment #2**

149 Are you in favor of the adoption of amendments to the existing Town of Thornton Zoning Ordinance
150 Floodplain Development Ordinance, as proposed by the Town of Thornton Planning Board, as follows:

151
152 Amend Section II: Establishment, second paragraph to read:

153 The following regulations in this ordinance shall apply to all lands designated as special flood
154 hazard areas by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in its "Flood Insurance
155 Study for Grafton County, NH" dated February 20, 2008 as amended, together with associated
156 flood insurance rate maps dated February 20, 2008, or as amended, which are declared to be a
157 part of this ordinance and are hereby incorporated by reference.

158
159 Amend Section VI: Certification, Paragraph 1. to read:

160 1. The as-built elevation (in relation to Mean Sea Level) of the lowest floor (including
161 basement) and include whether or not such structures contain a basement.

162
163

- 164 Amend Section VI: Certification, Paragraph 1.a. to read:
165 a. If the structure has been flood-proofed, the as-built elevation (in relation to Mean Sea
166 Level) to which the structure was flood-proofed.
- 167 Amend Section IX. Special Flood Hazard Areas to delete all references to 100-year flood elevation and
168 replace it with Base Flood Elevation.
- 169
170 Amend Section IX. Special Flood Hazard Areas, Paragraph 6.c., third sentence, to read:
171 A minimum of two flood openings having a total net area of not less than one square inch for
172 every square foot of enclosed area subject to flooding shall be provided.
- 173
174 Amend Section X: Variances and Appeals, Paragraph 2 to change the reference from RSA 674:33, I(b)
175 to **RSA 674:33, I.**
- 176
177 Amend Section XI: Definitions to add the following definitions:
178 "Base Flood Elevation" (BFE) means the elevation of surface water resulting from the base
179 flood.
180 "Flood Opening" means an opening in a foundation of enclosure walls that allows automatic
181 entry and exit of floodwaters. See FEMA "Technical Bulletin 1, Openings in Foundation Walls
182 and Walls of Enclosures."
- 183
184 Amend Section XI. Definitions to delete the definition of "Functionally Dependent Use".
- 185
186 Amend Section XI. Definitions to delete the existing definition of "Substantial Improvement" and insert
187 the following:
188 "Substantial Improvement" means any reconstruction rehabilitation, addition, or other
189 improvement of a structure, the cost of which equals or exceeds 50 percent of the market value
190 of the structure before the "start of construction" of the improvement. This term includes
191 structures which have incurred "substantial damage," regardless of the actual repair work
192 performed. The term does not, however, include either:
193 a. Any project for improvement of a structure to correct existing violations of state or local
194 health, sanitary, or safety code specifications which have been identified by the local code
195 enforcement official and which are the minimum necessary to assure safe living conditions;
196 or
197 b. Any alteration of a "historic structure," provided that the alteration will not preclude the
198 structure's continued designation as a "historic structure."
- 199
200 Amend Section XI. Definitions to delete the incomplete sentence "Additional Sections Required", which
201 follows the definition of "Water Surface Elevation"
- 202
203 Ms. Decoteau asked for public comment. There was none, and the public hearing was closed at 6:12
204 p.m.
- 205 **MOTION: "To move forward with proposed amendment #1 for the 2023 Zoning Ordinance."**
206 **Motion:** F. Freeman
207 **Second:** C. Schofield
208 **Discussion:** None
209 **Roll Call Vote:** N. Decoteau – yes, S. Babin – yes, F. Freeman – yes, P. Laufenberg – yes, D.
210 O'Donnell – yes, Cynthia Schofield – yes, J. Gaites – yes
211 **Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN**
212 **Motion passes.**
- 213
214 **MOTION: "To move forward with proposed amendment #2 for the 2023 Zoning Ordinance."**
215 **Motion:** P. Laufenberg
216 **Second:** D. O'Donnell
217 **Discussion:** None
218

Roll Call Vote: N. Decoteau – yes, S. Babin – yes, F. Freeman – yes, P. Laufenberg – yes, D. O'Donnell – yes, Cynthia Schofield – yes, J. Gaites – yes
Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN
Motion passes.

MOTION: "To add a third amendment to the 2023 Zoning Ordinance removing the language regarding short-term rentals that was voted on in 2021."

Motion: S. Babin

Second: None

Discussion: Planner Menici stated any amendment being proposed by the Planning Board must be publicly noticed in a timely manner.

Mr. Babin stated there has been massive confusion with short-term rentals and legal counsel and the BOS have not provided any guidance.

Ms. Decoteau asked for a second to Mr. Babin's motion and one was not given.

2. APPLICATION/PUBLIC HEARING – Site Plan Review; US Route 3 [Map 227, Lot 2] Kevin Dorsey for White Mountain Escapes. *Construct a residential cluster condominium subdivision; 18 single family homes with shared common land.*

Ms. O'Donnell and Ms. Schofield recused themselves from the Board as they are abutters.

The Board reviewed the application and planner review. Ms. Decoteau commented that three (3) letters from abutters had been submitted for the record as well. Ms. Decoteau stated that the planner review and Board counsel have recommended that the application not be accepted at this time, as there are several items missing or in question. She stated the public hearing cannot be opened unless the application is accepted as complete.

Mr. Freeman commented that counsel is advising the board that there are outstanding road issues that need to be addressed before the Board should accept the application as substantially complete. A lengthy discussion on the completeness of the application as well as notification to the applicant on missing items occurred.

Mr. Dorsey asked if he could address the Board about his application without opening the public hearing and discussion continued. Mr. Laufenberg stated that since Mr. Dorsey was present, he does not see reason why he couldn't answer questions of the Board without opening the public hearing. Discussion continued.

MOTION: "To accept the application as substantially complete."

Motion: S. Babin

Second: None

The Board allowed Mr. Dorsey to present his application, and should they find there is enough information given, they will determine if the public hearing can be opened.

Mr. Dorsey thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. He stated he wants to be a good neighbor to abutters and will work with them to address any concerns they may have. Mr. Dorsey reviewed that he has built other developments in Thornton with great success, and he would like to develop the field on US Route 3, formerly the Ham Farm, with 18, single family houses with shared common land. He reviewed that he wants to disturb as little land as possible and attempt to keep the openness of the property.

Mr. Dorsey commented that the driveway currently in place is for one (1), single family home and he has applications in to NHDOT for an amendment to his driveway permit to allow use by the other homes to be built. He stated he has had conversations with Chief Defosses, and Chief Defosses has not indicated that he has any concerns with the road or where cisterns are placed on the parcel.

Mr. Laufenberg asked if the Fire Chief has submitted a letter addressing the concerns of the road width and size of the cul-de-sac and Planner Menici stated she has asked for a letter and has not heard back from Chief Defosses.

Mr. Dorsey stated he has submitted a waiver request for a 50-foot ROW, as the road will be private and will not require a ROW like town roads. He stated that the road will always be a private road and never taken over by the Town; HOA documents have been drafted to reflect this. Mr. Dorsey stated that if the waiver is not granted, the previously approved subdivision and boundary line adjustment will not happen. He stated if the road needs to be wider than 20 feet, he will not be able to build the 18 planned houses.

Mr. Dorsey stated this will affect not only his plans, but those of the neighbors benefitting from the subdivision and boundary line adjustment. Discussion on road width continued.

Planner Menici stated that Mr. Dorsey is calling his access to the property a driveway and the Town only allows for two (2) lots to be accessed by a shared driveway. She stated the proposed plan is creating 18 individual building envelopes, and therefore the driveway in question is non-compliant and Ms. Decoteau commented that it cannot be called a driveway if approved.

Ms. Decoteau reviewed missing items from the checklist and Mr. Dorsey stated he has been asking for weeks if he required anything else to his submitted application to which Mr. Laufenberg commented that Thornton is a small town with limited employees.

Mr. Dorsey stated he did not have to go through this process when he developed other areas in Thornton, and Mr. Freeman stated that the Board is trying to be better in ensuring that all items are covered. Mr. Laufenberg clarified that if there are items on the checklist that are not applicable to the project, they need to be noted as such in a note on the plan.

Ms. Decoteau commented that there are concerns with drainage and floodplain, and Mr. Dorsey stated those concerns are referenced in a letter from an abutter, Mr. Peznola, PE. He stated that he appreciates the letter, and those concerns can be addressed with a third-party review. Mr. Dorsey suggested that the third-party review and Planning Board review be done laterally.

Mr. Babin commented that he would like to caution Mr. Dorsey that the clock is not starting because the Board did not give him enough information, and the delay is not the applicant's fault. He stated that he read the letter from Mr. Peznola and commented that while Mr. Peznola is familiar with the process, he does his work in Massachusetts and the process is different.

MOTION: "To accept the application as substantially complete."

Motion: S. Babin

Second: P. Laufenberg

Discussion: None

Roll Call Vote: N. Decoteau – yes, S. Babin – yes, F. Freeman – yes, P. Laufenberg – yes, J. Gaites – yes

Vote: 5 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN

Motion passes.

Ms. Decoteau opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Ms. Decoteau stated that letters from abutters Joe Peznola, Byron O'Donnell, and Cindy Schofield had been received and the Board has them for review.

Mr. Laufenberg stated that the driveway was put in as gravel and at some point, Mr. Dorsey would have come before this board with the plan to pave it on a site plan. He stated Mr. Dorsey has already paved the road and commented that it was very bold move to pave it already. Mr. Laufenberg stated that Mr.

329 Dorsey had the right to pave but doing so before site plan review puts the Board in a tough position.
330 He asked Mr. Dorsey how the gravel driveway got to the point of a paved road.

331
332 Mr. Dorsey stated the gravel was put in to allow access to NHEC to start work on burying the power
333 lines and that it made sense, from a building standpoint, to have the access in the same place that the
334 road would eventually be. He stated he received a ZCA to build one (1) house and the drive was
335 extended past the house; the drive was still gravel at that point. Mr. Dorsey stated NHEC required an
336 area to store and lay down equipment, resulting in the decision to pave the drive and create an
337 additional lay down area.

338
339 Mr. Dorsey stated he can understand that paving the driveway could be considered crossing a line, but
340 there are no limits to the size of a driveway. He stated that the property is currently being advertised on
341 NNEREN as potential building lots, pending Town approval, and there is no money involved for
342 deposits or other transactions.

343
344 Planner Menici stated the regulations clearly say that no construction can be done on a site where an
345 application is in process and discussion continued.
346 Ms. Decoteau opened the public hearing.

347
348 Ms. Schofield, as an abutter, asked that Keach-Nordstrom not be considered for third party review on
349 this application, as the plans indicate that they had previously done work on this parcel. A lengthy
350 discussion on whether or not Keach-Nordstrom acting as a third-party reviewer would be a conflict of
351 interest occurred.

352
353 Planner Menici stated she will reach out to Mr. Keach to see if there is a conflict, but she does not
354 believe that there is one, as Mr. Dorsey explained that Keach-Nordstrom was not involved in any part of
355 his purchasing and developing the parcel.

356
357 Ms. Schofield reviewed that the ZCA asks:
358 *"Is any part of this property currently being used for business, commercial or in-home business*
359 *use?"*

360
361 *"Will any part of the construction being applied for with this ZCA be used for business,*
362 *commercial or in-home business use?"*

363
364 *"If you answered YES to either of these questions, please provide Planning Board approval of*
365 *said use."*

366
367 Ms. Schofield stated that since the preliminary consultation in February, commercial development has
368 been evident on the site based on the following:

- 369
- Cutting of the road began on March 1, 2022
 - Heavy equipment was being used to move materials
 - This included woodchippers, trailers, dump trucks, etc.
 - Logging began at 5:30 a.m. for five (5) days
 - Commercial floodlights were on site and in use
- 374

375 Ms. Schofield stated the noise and disruption to the abutters was a significant concern, and she finds it
376 very odd that all the activity occurring was for a homeowner building a house.

377
378 Ms. Schofield stated the site plan for this project was received on November 11, 2022 and commercial
379 activity was already occurring. She stated electric services have been put in along the road and
380 telephone lines had been run. Ms. Schofield stated that Mr. Dorsey has stated on multiple occasions
381 that the overhead power lines currently on site would be buried and that has still not occurred.

382

Ms. Schofield stated materials were being moved off site and there was no signage on Route 3 indicating that trucks were entering or exiting the work area.

Mr. O'Donnell, an abutter, stated that he witnessed gravel being taken from the site to another site also owned by Mr. Dorsey, as well as topsoil being moved. He commented that if those trucks moving materials crossed town lines, that is a problem.

Mr. O'Donnell shared his concerns as follows:

- A road has already been constructed without Planning Board approval
- What benefits, besides being able to build more houses, would a waiver of the width of the road provide?
- When are the overhead power lines being buried, as that has been promised since the preliminary consultations began last February.
- Business at the Shamrock Motel has been lost, as guests do not want to be next to a construction site.
- The site is an eyesore and appears to be a sand pit being used to move materials off site.

Mr. O'Donnell expressed concern with the parcel being overdeveloped. He stated Owl's Nest is a tightly developed area and he is concerned that this site will become 'Owl's Nest North' if it is not regulated.

Mr. O'Donnell stated water usage is also a major concern as there will be 18 wells and 18 septic systems, and he questioned if there had been a study done to show how those will affect neighbors' wells and water supplies. He also stated that if the economy takes a turn, there could be unfinished shells of houses left for months. He also asked that a site visit occur with the potential houses marked out in order for the Board and public to get an idea of what is being proposed.

Mr. Peznola, an abutter, stated that he is not opposed to the project, but more information needs to be obtained for the Board to properly deliberate. He reviewed that he has submitted a letter that states some concerns he has with missing information and commented that there are state and town regulations that still need to be met.

Mr. Peznola strongly insisted that a third-party engineering review be done on the plans. Mr. Peznola stated that Mr. Dorsey's waiver request is for a 50-foot ROW, not the width of the road and an additional waiver request would need to be submitted for the road.

Mr. Peznola stated that Mr. Dorsey has alluded that if the ROW waiver is not approved, the ROW would need to come out of the acreage calculation, resulting in the previous subdivision and BLA being null and preventing him from building 18 houses; this is disingenuous of the applicant.

Mr. Peznola stated that the Board should not be granting waivers to do more than is allowed in the regulations and the regulations are clear that it is the Board's decision as to if application is complete. He commented that the fact that most of this meeting has been taken up deciding if an application is complete is not a good practice and hard to understand.

Mr. Peznola commented that while he performs work in Massachusetts, he is a NH registered engineer and Thornton is his home. He stated he lives here and wants his property protected.

Ms. Lewis, Chair of the Conservation Commission (CC) and member of the Pemi River Local Advisory Committee (PRLAC) stated this project raised a red flag for both entities, as there were no permits submitted and there is question on the amount of land being disturbed. She commented that piles of materials on the property are a disruption, and she would like an estimate of how much has been disturbed.

Mr. Dorsey stated he is below the 100,000 square foot disturbance threshold that would trigger an Alteration of Terrain (AOT) permit from the State. Ms. Lewis asked Mr. Dorsey for an estimated number, and he stated he would get that information to her.

Mr. Dorsey stated he was unaware that he needed a permit from the CC. Ms. Lewis asked what the distance from the rivers edge was; if that distance is within a certain amount of feet, the CC will need to be consulted. Mr. Duffield stated the proposed houses are out of the 250-foot setback area from the Pemi and do not need a shoreline permit. He stated the State already approved the subdivision submitted with no concerns about shoreline.

Ms. Lewis commented that she is concerned with flooding, as the 100-year flood measurements are not accurate and the new floodplain maps may have an effect on the development if the flood levels are increased. Discussion on current flood levels occurred.

Ms. Schofield expressed concern with an additional entrance for potentially 36 cars entering and exiting from Route 3 causing traffic and potential accidents. Mr. Dorsey stated he has received an approved driveway permit from NHDOT for an entrance for 18 single family homes.

Ms. O'Donnell, as an abutter, expressed concern with the timeline of the project. She stated the houses would be built as they are bought, and she is worried that the site will be a construction zone for years. She stated her business at the Shamrock Motel will be disturbed for years depending on how quickly the houses are built and sold.

Mr. Swartz, resident, stated he is concerned with the type of housing being proposed. He commented that Mr. Dorsey has stated the houses will be upwards of \$650,000.00 homes, and if that is the going rate for a home in Thornton it will drive people out.

Ms. Decoteau asked for any additional comments. As there were none, Ms. Decoteau asked for a motion to continue the public hearing to the January 19, 2023 meeting.

MOTION: "To continue the public hearing for Site Plan Review; US Route 3 [Map 227, Lot 2] Kevin Dorsey for White Mountain Escapes to January 19, 2023."

Motion: P. Laufenberg

Second: N. Decoteau

Discussion: None

Roll Call Vote: N. Decoteau – yes, S. Babin – yes, F. Freeman – yes, P. Laufenberg – yes, J. Gaites – yes

Vote: 5 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN

Motion passes.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Preliminary Discussion: Jeff Morey, Proposed Subdivision [Map 234, Lot 53]

Jeff Morey reviewed that he is looking to subdivide his property into two (2) lots with a shared driveway, but in doing so this would create a third lot using the driveway as two (2) lots are already using the shared drive.

Planner Menici commented that a waiver could be requested, but the Planning Board has been very strict with only allowing a shared driveway between two (2) lots and a waiver has never been granted.

Planner Menici reviewed that Mr. Morey had submitted an application for the subdivision and she had advised him to come for a consultation to work out the driveway question.

Mr. Freeman asked if another driveway permit could be issued from NHDOT for Route 49 and Mr. Morey stated the process could take up to three (3) years to get approval and money that cannot be refunded regardless of the decision.

George Perry, abutter, stated his property [Map 234, Lot 53] is the second lot that uses the current shared driveway, and he does not use it, as he has an access off of Chickenboro Road. Mr. Perry stated he is willing to relinquish his rights to the shared driveway.

Mr. Freeman commented that it sounds like this matter can be resolved between them without the Planning Board getting involved.

Mr. Morey summerized that if the abutting landowner (Mr. Perry) relinquishes the right to use the NHDOT approved shared driveway, then it would be possible for his existing lot, and a proposed newly subdivided lot, to use the existing NH DOT approved shared driveway. Mr. Morey thanked the Board for their time.

2. Preliminary Discussion: Thornton Central School Proposed Improvements

Mark Fischler, Jason Bergeron, John Bownes, and Kevin Leonard reviewed a proposed parking lot realignment that would have the current access being an entrance and a new exit would be built to exit onto Sunrise Hill Road.

Mr. Leonard reviewed the proposed new traffic pattern and stated that he spoke with Road Agent Kubik who had some concerns for the residents on Sunrise Hill Road that would be affected. Mr. Leonard stated it was suggested that more input should be given by residents.

Mr. Leonard stated that, at peak hours, there will be increased traffic onto Sunrise Hill Road, but the traffic circulation will be better at the school.

Mr. Leonard stated that once the project is approved at the school meeting, they will be coming before the Planning Board formally with the proposed improvement project.

Ms. Decoteau stated that any additional questions that did not involve the topic at hand regarding the proposed exit onto Sunrise Hill Road need to be addressed at the school meeting.

The representatives from the school project thanked the Board for their time.

3. Master Plan Update

Ms. O'Donnell stated there are two (2) public meetings scheduled in January and she is hoping for members of the Town's various boards and committees attend. She stated more information will be coming, and she will keep the Board updated.

4. Stipend Discussion

Mr. Laufenberg, as ex-officio, stated that the BOS is going through budget and there was a conversation about stipends. He stated it was pointed out that the Planning Board is the only elected board that does not receive a stipend. Mr. Laufenberg stated the BOS is asking for the thoughts of Planning Board members on if they are opposed to receiving a stipend.

Mr. Freeman stated he did not run and serve his position on the Board to receive money. He commented that if a stipend was given, he would not refuse it, but that was not why he ran for his position.

Mr. Babin recommended that the BOS eliminate stipends all around.

Ms. Schofield stated if she was dissatisfied with not receiving a stipend, she would not have run for her position on the Board. No further discussion was had on the topic of stipends.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: "To adjourn at 8:25 p.m."

Motion: P. Laufenberg

Second: F. Freeman

Discussion: None

Roll Call Vote: N. Decoteau – yes, S. Babin – yes, F. Freeman – yes, P. Laufenberg – yes, D. O'Donnell – yes, Cynthia Schofield – yes, J. Gaites – yes

Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN

Motion passes.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kerrin Randall, Board Assistant