

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of June 4, 2014
APPROVED

Present: Sean James, Chairman; Ginny Clifford; Judi Lindsey; Michael Santa; Alt; Boyd Chivers, Alt BOS Rep; Dave Murray, Building Inspector; Carleton Robie, BOS; Dean Young, Fire Chief; D. Lewis Road Agent

Absent: Albert Hall III, Mark Siemonsma; Ken Kustra; Amanda Soares

Chair James called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes May 21, 2014

J. Lindsey **motioned** to accept the Minutes of May 21, 2014 as amended. M. Santa **seconded**. S. James, J. Lindsey, M. Santa, B. Chivers **were in favor**. **Motion passed (4-0-1)**. G. Clifford abstained.

Chairman James re-opened the public hearing for the continuance of Major Site Plan Merrimack Valley Paint 274 Main Street at 7:02 pm.

Continuance Major Site Plan: Applicant: Tony Fiore 103 Chadwick Street, Bradford MA 01835 & Michael Pelletier 31 Garfield Street Lawrence MA 01841 owners of Merrimack Valley Paint Ball, 103 Chadwick Street, Bradford MA 01835; Property owner: Rita Hobbs, P.O. Box 11, Candia NH 03034; Property location: 274 Old Candia Road, Candia NH 03034 Map 410 Lot 160; Intent: To re-establish and operate an outdoor paint ball facility in the woods & fields within the Light Industrial I District. For additional information, please call the Land Use Office at 483-8588.

Tony Fiore, Michael Pelletier and Karl Dubay, P.E. Dubay Group, Inc. were present for the applicant and no abutters were present.

K. Dubay said the last time they were heard the Board told them to acquire a Stantec review which they did and just received the review yesterday. He said Stantec was kind enough to meet with them this morning and had a productive work session and went through a lot of detail going over each comment. He said to bring the plans into accordance with the Town's regulations and ordinances generated a longer list than what they would normally do for a Major Plan. He said they worked to get a package to actually phase the project which is the first phase that has woods ball, wetland crossing and two recreation fields and tightening up some gravel parking. He said they are managing the SWWP through Mr. Gilday BAG Land Consultants Wetland Scientist. He said the priority is to get everything protected, cleaned and to get the two fields loamed and seeded and protected. He said they were permitted the DOT Driveway permit and Stantec asked them to follow up to make sure they are in compliance with the permit. He said Stantec correctly advised his client to revise their wetland permit to make sure it was accurate and to look at the other two before they are put in and to come back before the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board.

K. Dubay said they have a lot to follow up on and wanted to hit on key issues as they don't want to waste a lot of the Board's time. Chair James said that was a good overview and said the Board has not actually accepted the plans for discussion as complete.

Lindsey **motioned** to accept the application as complete for discussion. G. Clifford **seconded**. **All were in favor**

R. LaBranche said there are a lot of comments that are redundant and comments that reference different sheets. He said he identified about 8 comments that are applicable. He said the first comment, #1 talks about the dredge and fill permit which they noted is not consistent with what they actually did. The plan showed a 12' long pipe they put a 25 or 30' foot pipe and in addition they have not finished the job. He said he looked at the wetland permit submitted and they are proposing 2 other wetland crossings and felt not enough was addressed for what the applicant wanted to do and suggested amending the permit.

R. LaBranche said item #4, was concerning the boulder retaining walls. He said they went out and reviewed them and some of them look like boulders retaining walls and some look like stabilized stone slopes, and they suggested putting both details on the plans and for their designers go out there and verify what they did because the details show cut soil and stone on stone with fabric behind it to keep the soil from migrating through which he doesn't believe is what they did and they need to verify that and to see if they need to make any modifications and address the details on the plans.

R. LaBranche said item #5, wood guardrail shows certain details on the plan such as notches cut in the telephone poles and another telephone pole running horizontally bolted with carriage bolts but based on their observations they lag bolted it and only one or two of them they may have been notched. He said their engineers need to take a look at this and see if they can support that on the plan as a valid guard rail. He said he has no issues with location and said they don't know how long the posts are in the ground and they would like to see 3-4 feet similar to DOT. T. Fiore said they buried the posts 5 feet deep.

R. LaBranche said on item #8, this project is within the Ground water protection and a storm water management plan is required with one part being the SWPP part which they are doing and he would like to see them provide an overview of what they are doing relative to sizing the culverts as part of the plan. He said they could go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment and ask for a waiver as it is a zoning ordinance.

There was a lengthy discussion on item # 9 relative to the DOT sign right of way. R. LaBranche said there are some inconsistencies, he said the applicant met with DOT on site and DOT said yes put the sign here and the engineer showed where the right of way is and DOT ended up allowing them by directing them to put the sign within the right of way where he thought he was directing them to put it outside of the right of way so now there is an inconsistency on where the plans shows the sign. He said the requirements on the driveway permit said it shall be outside of the right of way and this can be resolved with a letter from DOT.

Item #15 talked about the potential for temporary outdoor site lighting that is noted on the plan if the intent was to keep the facility open and have competitions until 10:00pm at night. T, Fiore said they wanted to stay open until 10:00pm the same as the Candia First Stop was open. R. LaBranche suggested do not deal with the temporary lighting as that creates all its own issues and suggested running the business during daylight hours and come back with a lighting plan to allow extending their hours. K. Dubay said they would put the hours of operation on the plan from dawn to dusk. Chairman James said they put daylight hours on farm stand. K. Dubay said to clarify the only games at night would be on the competition fields which would need lighting that they would have to come back to the board with that so they will remove it.

R. LaBranche said a lot of the other items in the letter are what they call clean up items. He said they did not discuss with the applicant about putting protective netting in for the woods competitions near two Town parcels and wanted to talk to the Board to see if the town would be concerned. He said an extreme scenario would be the boy scouts were doing something on the town land and see the paint ball activity and come stand over there next thing and possible get hit. B. Chivers said could the town reserve the right to demand that at later date, if it becomes an issue and put it as a stipulation on the plan? R. LaBranche agreed. Chairman James said as far as he knows there is no use for the properties and there are two BOS here tonight to help identify its use. R. LaBranche said they are looking at 300' feet of fencing.

R. LaBranche said he knows there has been a lot of discussion with the Board relative to activity on the site and where do you go from here. He said there is a lot of administrative items but at the same time the site has been sitting and his review of the site is there are things that should happen immediately like stabilizing the wetland crossing. He noticed some silt fences not installed correctly so one of the suggestions they would make was that the Board allow the applicant and his wetland Scientist to evaluate and do some recommendations and implement erosion controls to stabilize the site even more. He said the grades of the parking area and the playing fields he does not have any issue with so if the Board wanted to work with them to allow them to start grading the fields, they would recommend allowing the applicant to start grading the fields. In the meantime they could finish the paperwork before they would recommend them using the facility and expand out to do other things and in the process. He said they fall under federal

permits such as an NOI which he understands is done or going to be done in the next day or so. T. Fiore said they have a number now. R. LaBranche said they have to submit a NOI to the EPA website and receive a number which starts the 14 day period before you can actually do any earth moving activities. He said in the meantime they need a SWPP which is part of the Storm Water Management Plan discussed earlier. He said at that point let the applicant work on the lower field and practice field

R. LaBranche said the intent is to stabilize a large area that is not stable right now as they need to grass the fields which are gravel now and do general site stabilization on the entire property with the SWPP. B. Chivers asked if they plan on grassing it now and opening it up for business and T. Fiore said they would not open it up until it has been grassed and the netting has been put up and they have complied with all the requirements.

R. LaBranche said what he has envisioned administratively is to give them a conditional approval with one condition being to stabilize those areas and second get the SWPP in place and proceed with the field work and at the same time work on addressing all the rest of the administrative problems. He said on their plan they had proposed using either grass or synthetic and he said if they are going to use synthetic to provide a detail.

Chairman James addressed comment #3 which talks about many of the site improvements were constructed after the plan was prepared because the plan does not accurately represents existing conditions. R. LaBranche said

the plans were a snap shot in time of what the surveyor actually caught and when they finished their survey and drawings things were still moving around such as loam piles and is not representative of what is out there now. For example the original plan shows putting a gate in one spot entrance and right of way but it actually got installed in a different spot further into the driveway. The plan should be representative of what they actually built and are going to build. K. Dubay said they will update the plans. R. LaBranche said he doesn't think the updates are necessarily significant consequential to a final approval but should be fixed.

R. LaBranche asked about the poles and beam near the trailers and T. Fiore said they decided to voluntarily take the canopy down instead of going back and have a structural engineer check it out and continued all of it will be removed. K. Dubay said they were originally shown on the plan and will be removed.

R. LaBranche said the ordinances say some type of boundary survey has to be referenced. He said their plan references another plan and suggested to have their licensed land survey chase this and put a note in that discusses all of this. K. Dubay said that can be done. Their surveyor has gone out and located boundaries and calculated that in and it indeed does match the available recorded deeds and plans. He said the previous surveys and boundary markers were accurate. He said they did a full ground survey from the wetland line all the way around the proposed work area. B. Gilday from BAG Land Consultants located boundaries and they used a state plan coordinates system both horizontal and vertical on those standards and also compared them to other plans that were prepared by others. He said J. Franklin actually did a survey of part of the property many years ago.

R. LaBranche said the last item the Town typically requires is some sort of surety which is the Board's decision and if the Board feels this is necessary they can provide that.

Discussion of the side netting near the Town property was brought up again by Chairman James and he said his thought was it made sense to have it on the other side and understands it is another expense. He asked if he was out there playing paintball how would you know not to go beyond that line. T. Fiore said they use a boundary caution tape line and before every game they do a safety orientation and there are also referees present. He said paint ball is a game of accuracy with no wild over shooting going and the objectives are toward the center of the playing area not the edges. He said there would have to be a perfect storm of scenarios going on for that to happen and they would have to wildly miss their opponent and have it go far out to get into another property which is a stretch and he can't envision that happening the way they have it set up now. B. Chivers said they could bond for it and if the Town ever needed it. T. Fiore said they are very safety focused and voluntarily put up the netting near the trail. He said they could put the caution tape further into their lot to create a buffer zone. He said putting it back 75 feet would be over kill

and would voluntarily put it at 20 feet and players know they are automatically out if they step out of bounds so they avoid it and a spectator would have to be standing on the property line and someone intentionally shooting at them. R. LaBranche said looking at it is already 25 to 60 feet back. M. Santa asked him to explain how the caution tape would actually work and T. Fiore said it is from tree to tree and is explained before each game they have an orientation and safety meeting and he said a large percentage of their players are experienced and understand the rules.

Chairman James asked the Board if they had any questions and hearing none opened up the discussion for questions and comments from the audience. D. Young said he would like to address the minutes from the last meeting on May 21, 2014. He said on page 3, *“M. Siemonsma said he refrained from sitting on the Board tonight because he wanted to give his comments raised about the parking and continued saying have you been by cruise night with the parking on Route 27? He said there are selectmen involved in the cruise night and it is a mess on the road from parking He said he doesn’t think it is fair for this Board to try and justify taking away their parking on the road when on cruise night the Board of Selectmen take over the whole road. He said he doesn’t think it’s fair to be addressing this issue but if they are going to address it they should also address the parking issue with the cruise night and keep the cars off the road. He said cars are parked up and down and across the road and you can’t get a fire truck through and for the Board to be worried about the paintball facility parking on the road is not fair..... M. Santa said his concern would be keeping the access road clear to the woods and have a way to control traffic flow in and out of the site so there won’t be a cruise night situation”* D. Young said he will speak with two hats on as Fire Chief and as resident of town. He said he heard about this comment shortly after the meeting and was livid. As Fire Chief he does know about fire access and had to make several inspections at Exit 3 where he reviewed the parking area before he approached the owners of Exit 3 about the idea of a cruise night and they absolutely loved the idea. He said cruise nights are fun with old cars, and a gathering/social place to meet with friends that is fun. His idea as a private citizen was to have the cruise night and everyone he talked too loved the idea and one of them happened to be a selectmen. He said this is not a selectmen cruise night and wanted to go on record to correct was written in the last minutes that said it was a selectmen cruise night. He said the beneficiary of the cruise night, being a nonprofit, is the Candia Volunteer Fire Fighter’s Association. He said the whole idea was for people to come with their beautiful cars and have a good time and continued they do not take over the whole road and there was only one night when there was a parking issue but they had policemen present and that was the night of the Marion fund raiser and if you did happen to go there that night it was something amazing that happened within four days of their accident and is one of the most amazing things he has ever seen happen in this Town.

D. Young said there is no issue with parking on the highway and they only parked across the street on that one occasion and cars do park on the same side of Candia First Stop where it is manicured and people can walk along easily and there are not people crossing the street. He said he doesn’t know if they can’t park on the road and no one has ever said anything.

He said as Fire Chief I am concerned about getting fire trucks in and out. He said they make it so that you can always get tractor trailers in and around the building to get to the diesel pumps and if a tractor trailer can get through so can a fire truck. He said for some unknown reason the cruise night is so popular that many people come and if you have never been come on down it is very cool. They have ice cream they have music and beautiful cars to look at and everybody is having a good time. He said he is not sure who would complain about it and not sure why M. Siemonsma said what he did in the last minutes and wished he was here tonight to ask him why he would make the comment the road is a mess. Everyone clapped and thanked D. Young for his comments.

Chairman James said when they discuss the minutes from that meeting tonight they can make a notation in the minutes that you had a comment. D. Young said he doesn’t want to go against what he said as he has his own opinion he just wanted to make sure it gets in these minutes on how it really is. Chairman James said the overall opinion the Board gave was that it is a state issue and they were just asking how many cars they could park not where they parked. Chairman James said he appreciated D. Young coming and speaking and D. Young thanked the Board for their time.

R. LaBranche said their thought process was letting the applicant go back on site and reinforce and stabilize the erosion control measures on the wetland crossing because if they got a real significant rain event it would push silt and dirt right into the wetlands. He said there are 2 large areas that are basically gravel now, and they have looked at the contours relative to the two fields and suggested letting them get in there to grade, loam and seed. He said he understands if you do not want to give them permission until the SWPP 14 day period takes place. He said they can continue at the same to work on the outstanding items and get back to the Board with a final review and recommendation and said that is their recommendation they are making right now.

T. Fiore said they are only open right now for woods ball. B. Chivers asked if there are any safety issues now having it open for business. R. LaBranche said he suggest not using the poles and superstructure near container and what he is hearing it sounds like the guardrail is more substantial and can't think any other safety issues at this point. T. Fiore said the poles in front of the containers are going to be removed. He said he is hoping to get the approval to do the grading and will use the machinery to remove the poles and grading all the same time.

Chairman James said the approach makes sense but doesn't feel they are quite ready for a conditional approval. B. Chivers said what would the motion be, to allow the applicant to proceed with steps outlined by R. LaBranche while they are finalizing and addressing the issues on the plans? R. LaBranche said the limit they are suggesting is they allow them to go in and reinforce the erosion control, stabilize the one wetland crossing and to grade, loam and seed to stabilize the two fields with no other activity on site with first step immediate erosion control measures and when SWPP is completed and their 14 day waiting period is over then go work on the fields. B. Chivers asked if they are going to hydro-seed the fields as it is getting past the time to plant grass and T. Fiore not sure yet and have been working on the requirements for the town and have been unable to plant.

B. Chivers made a **motion** to allow the applicant to proceed with the steps outlined by R. LaBranche from Stantec, stabilize the wetlands and grade & seed the playing fields after the 14 day notice for NOI and produce their storm water protection plan with no work to exceed this scope until plan is submitted with recommendation by Stantec on conditional approval with waiver requests. K. Dubay said there are waiver notes on the plans they are going to put in a letter for official request and other waivers that were discussed. J. Lindsey **seconded. All were in favor.**

K. Dubay said they will have everything done by the next meeting but not sure if Stantec will have time to review. T. Fiore asked if they should come back to the next meeting to show their progress showing they have complied with everything. Chairman James suggested the next meeting after June 18, 2014 which would be July 2, 2014. R. LaBranche said he is hoping everything happens and the SWPP is reviewed and they have a letter for the Board to review, saying the applicant has complied with everything so the Board will be able to approve the applicant that night.

Chairman James closed the Public hearing and continued the hearing until July 2, 2014 and said he realizes there are no abutters and there will not be any further notice.

Major Site Plan: Applicant: William & Donna Cooper 325 Patten Hill Road, Candia NH 03034; Property owner: Same; Property location: 325 Patten Hill Road, Candia NH 03034 Map 414 Lot 108-1 & 108-2; Intent: To create 1 building lot and a lot line adjustment for 108-2 within the Residential District. For additional information, please call the Land Use Office at 483-8588. William Cooper & Jim Franklin, Land Surveyor were present for the applicant. Abutters Arthur Sanborn, 312 Chester Road and Joseph & Leslie Vasilio 235 Patten Hill Road were present.

Chairman James said earlier tonight they reviewed the plan and went through the check list and there are some items to talk about but in general the plan was complete and he recommended accepting the plan as complete.

J. Lindsey **motioned** to accept the application complete for discussion. G. Clifford **seconded. All were in favor.**

J. Franklin said what they would like to do is add approximately one acre from Lot 108-1 and attached it to Lot 108-2 in the rear the lot which has the existing home and the second is create a new

building lot 108-3 that is 3.1 acres. He said he conducted a boundary survey, a topographic survey, wetlands identification, and mapping and also had Bruce Gilday, Soils Scientist look at the entire property for classification for the soils. He said they had an informational meeting about a year ago or longer and since then they have applied for and received State Subdivision approval to create Lot 108-3 and that is where they are tonight.

Chairman James said they received 2 waiver requests; the first waiver request was to be heard as a Minor Subdivision, which can be heard in one hearing, not a Major Subdivision which has to have a preliminary and final hearing. He said the size of Lot 108-1 is 103 acres which puts the 1 lot subdivision into the Major Subdivision category. J. Franklin said it will eliminate one hearing and a Minor Subdivision can be decided in one meeting.

J. Franklin said the second waiver request is 10.06C Boundary Survey on the Lot 108-1 which is the 103 acre property. He said it is family land and they are not planning to do anything with the back land. He said he did survey of the land along Patten Hill Road to certify the remaining access for Lot 108-1 which would be 203 feet, Lot 108-3 would have 200.5 feet and Lot 108.2 would have 200.00 feet. J. Franklin said Lot 108-2's frontage is not changing. He pointed out the 25 foot curve radius on the Lot 108-2 and said that is an original from the subdivision that created Lot 108-2 because at the time they put in a radius incase they wanted to put in a road but the length of the Road is prohibitive 730' to subdivide.

M. Santa asked if he is reading the plan correctly that the access to the Lot 108-3 is from a shared drive. W. Cooper said there is room to put another driveway in on the new Lot 108-3 and he has talked to the Road Agent about a driveway off the frontage and continued it would work better for them using the paved driveway to access the new lot and being family land they didn't care where the driveway went over the boundaries. He said the plan shows the paved driveway going into the new lot but they will have it marked out where a driveway can be put in. B. Chivers said once this is approved there will have to be easements added to allow access from the paved shared driveway. He asked if the Road Agent would authorize a driveway. D. Lewis said in the past with shared driveways in a subdivision there still has to have a place for a driveway location on that lot.

Chairman James read from the Building Inspector's review letter, *"I have reviewed the proposed subdivision plan with Lot line adjustments for Map 414 Lots 108-1 & 108-2 located at 325 Patten Hill Road and owned by the Coopers. It appears to be a near perfect scenario to create a building lot. The road agent will need to decide if a driveway permit will be issued. The proposal shows a shared driveway that has been allowed for other projects in the past however I have seen firsthand that such an arrangement can lead to problems between the neighbors at some point in the future. I would suggest that the site be designed to allow a private driveway to be built if it becomes necessary. Before any building permits can be issued for construction a septic design approved by the state will be required. I have no problem seeing this proposal granted approval."* Chairman James said the applicants said they will show the driveway on the frontage and D. Lewis said he can if he wants to but it can be anywhere on the frontage because the frontage doesn't change and it doesn't matter if it isn't shown on the plan as there isn't a unique spot where there is only one location for the driveway.

Chairman James said they have letters from Chief Dean Young dated June 4, 2014 saying he sees no safety issues and Chief McGillen said after reviewing the plans he finds no safety concerns. Chairman James said the issue comes down to legal ownership what if the lot gets sold, that person has a legal right to get to their house which could become an issue. B. Chivers said it wouldn't be a problem with the Town it would be between the two neighbors. D. Lewis said usually shared driveways come back to haunt the Town. J. Franklin said as an alternative there could be clause in the deed that when Lot 108-3 is sold to someone other than family they would be responsible for constructing their own driveway. W. Cooper said if that covers it, would be fine with him. J. Franklin said if they show the location of the driveway on the plan and if they want to change the location they would have to come back to the Board and D. Lewis said the driveway can be put in several places on this property and he would rather see a note and not show a specific location. B. Chivers suggested leaving the location of the driveway off the plan and put a stipulation on the deed and J. Franklin agreed as this would be a deed restriction. Chairman James

suggesting wording the restriction to say if sold they may be required to install their own driveway. J. Franklin said he could word it saying the common driveway is restricted to use of family only. If sold to someone outside family a new agreement could be made to allow them to use the common driveway. J. Franklin said they could not put in anything as the regulations permit common driveways. Chairman James suggested an easement and J. Franklin said he would bring something back to the Board with something the land owner is agreeable to. He said it is hard to develop wording that is not going to impact negatively either property. He said an easement or deed restriction will be added to the plan.

Arthur Sanborn lives at 312 Chester Road and their property that borders his property. He wanted to look at the plan. He said he known them and it is fine with the subdivision. Chairman James said hearing no more questions asked to get back to the waiver requests.

B. Chivers **motioned** to accept the waiver to be considered to be heard as a Minor Subdivision. Michael Santa **seconded. All were in favor.**

J. Lindsey **motioned** to accept the waiver on boundary 10.06C for Lot 108-1. B. Chivers **seconded. All were in favor.**

Chairman James now that they have been granted the waiver to be heard as a Minor Subdivisions they only require one hearing and they can move towards a conditional approval. He said he had 3 conditions to discuss; one is to install granite boundary or iron markers, and a statement from the assessor's office whether a property is in current use and the third an easement on the deed for the shared driveway with exact language to be provided for review. B. Chivers asked how can the Board grant conditional approval if they have not seen the language. J. Franklin said they would have to have another meeting. Chairman James suggested an easement which would be the cleanest and that would go with the property forever. J. Franklin said it would stay with the lot and to get it released the owner of Lot 108-3 would have to grant permission to release the easement and that could be a problem there as well.

Discussion continued. W. Copper said get the other driveway approved and put it where it says on the plan and then he can use his driveway if he wants to. Chairman James said since part of the existing paved driveway goes onto the new lot they need permission to use it. D. Lewis said a driveway permit is not required for a subdivision just as long as there is a place for one and then there is no restriction on where the driveway can go on the 200 feet of frontage and the lot can say sit for 10 years then they come in for a driveway permit and put it where they want. C. Robie said the existing paved drive swings over onto the new Lot 108-3 and they may have to move the driveway at some point if it is sold, because there is room on Lot 108-2 for the driveway. Chairman James said that condition can be taken off. B. Chivers said just put the driveway in. J. Franklin said if they put the driveway on the plan and they decide to put it somewhere else they have to come back to the Board to get approval. D. Lewis suggested not showing the driveway on the plans. J. Franklin said they will remove the common driveway note from plan and remove location of driveway.

B. Chivers **motioned** to grant conditional approval on the Major 1-Lot Subdivision and Lot Line Adjustment Map 414 Lots 108-1 & 108-2 & 108-3 with the following conditions: Install granite boundary markers and a letter from the assessor's office whether property is in current use and remove the shared driveway legend from the plan. J. Lindsey **seconded. All were in favor.** There was a discussion on the time frame to bring back the revised plans for the Board to sign. B. Chivers amended the **motion** to add: 90 days limit on the conditional approval. J. Lindsey **Seconded. All were in favor.** J. Franklin thanked the Board and said he will bring back the revised plans for the Board to sign.

Other Business

SNHPC Grant Opportunities

Chairman James said SNHPC currently has opportunities for two grants. One is the NH Charitable Foundation for Project Grant which is a grant to assist Weare, Candia and Chester and the application is due July 14th, 2014. It is concerning projects that would be undertaken next year. He said he talked to Jack Munn about the grant and the Town would get around \$6,000. He told J. Munn the Board has been working on updating/consolidating regulations into a single Land Use Regulation and asked when the document is done if SNHPC could review it. B. Chivers asked how the Planning Board applies for the grant and

Chairman James said they have show that it was discussed in the minutes and that it is the consensus of the Board to work with J. Munn on the grant. Chairman James said this grant does not require a town match and once we tell SNHPC what project the Planning Board wants they will include that in the grant application. Chairman James said they do a really good job and for approximately \$2,400 a year they do so much more. J. Lindsey they do much more then what they pay them for and they have the potential this year for \$6,000. Last year SNHPC submitted for a \$15,000 grant for a master plan update but unfortunately they did not get funded but many grants in the past were funded.

The second grant which also went to the BOS is opened ended by David Preece. Chairman James read from the email, *“We are still looking for one key project or plan that your municipality feels is the most important for your community in the next five to ten years. We are seeking this information from all municipalities in our region to frame a picture of what is most important to our communities and the region as a whole. If you could please post this question to your governing board and send me a short description (no longer than a paragraph, including photos or copies of plans, etc. if possible), we will incorporate this information as part of “Telling the Story” of our region for use in our regional plan. Our goal is to include this information in our draft plan by the end of June 2014.”*

Chairman James said the deadline to submit a Housing/Public Facilities CDBG application to CDFR is July 28, 2014. There is approximately \$1.8 million in funding available for this grant round. Last year’s round of funding, CDFR approved CDBG awards to 13 municipalities and counties, totaling a record \$5.27 million. These funds are going toward projects for developing affordable housing, public works, and upgrading failing infrastructure which benefit low-and moderate-income residents.

M. Santa said they do things for example if a mobile home park can be connected to public sewer you can get funding. J. Lindsey asked about solar panels on the school and M. Santa said he doesn’t believe so but may be able to grant funding for that through PSNH. B. Chivers asked if the grant funding is connected to low income and Chairman James said that is the criteria and said he doesn’t think they have anything identified just wanted to run it by the Board. J. Lindsey asked about D. Young’s comments and where they would put them or just in these minutes not the prior meeting. It was the consensus to leave his comments in these minutes.

J. Lindsey **motioned** to cancel the meeting on June 18, 2014 contingent that it is confirmed there is nothing on the agenda. B. Chivers **seconded. All were in favor.** The next scheduled Planning Board meeting is July 2, 2014 at 7pm at the Town Hall.

J. Lindsey **motioned** to adjourn at 8:50 pm. M. Santa **seconded. All were in favor.**

Respectfully submitted,
Sharon Robichaud
Land Use Secretary