

Haverhill Planning Board Minutes April 26, 2016

Draft Subject to Review, Correction, and Approval at Following Meeting

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 by Chairman Don Hammond

Planning Board members present:

Don Hammond

Mike Bonnano

Howard Hatch

Tara Krause at 7:15 pm

Clerk Ed Ballam was present.

Mike Simpson was excused due to a work conflict.

Members of the public included Harry Burgess, Susan and Elden Aldrich, Darwin Clogston and Joe Maccini (members of the highway advisory committee), Sheila Fadden, Interim Town Manager Jo Lacaillade, and Road Agent Stuart McDanolds.

2. Designation of Alternates

No alternates to designate

3. Agenda Approval

Mike B. made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Howard H. The motion was approved with a unanimous vote.

4. Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting

Mike B. made a motion to approve the minutes from the March. 22, 2016 meeting. Don H. seconded the motion. Howard H. abstained from the vote as he was not a member of the board at the time of the meeting. The motion carried.

5. Scheduled Public Appearances previously scheduled.

Harry Burgess, representing Ron Lackie, Mill Street, Woodsville, Map 103, Lot 106 and Eden Aldrich, Map 402 lot 35, appeared before the board for consideration of a lot line adjustment.

Don H. opened the public hearing at 7:05.

Ed B. asked if Harry B. had made any changes to the plats since he submitted them for review. Harry B. said had made no changes.

Harry B. said the property is behind the Woodsville Elementary School, over the dry bridge on Mill Street the first house on the right. Harry B. said Ron L. has about a half-acre lot and would like to buy about a half acre from his neighbor Eden A. Harry B. said the lot line is very close to Ron L.'s lot line and the adjustment would push the lot to the edge of the bank behind his house. Harry B. said the lot has town water and its own septic system behind the house.

Ed B. said the abutters have been warned, the notice have been posted and the application appears complete. Don H. agreed the application seems complete.

Don H. asked if anyone in the public had any comments or questions. Eden A. said he had no issues with the proposal and had worked out an agreement with Ron L.

Don H. said hearing no additional comments, he would close the public hearing. Mike B. made a motion to close the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. Howard H. seconded the motion. The vote to close the hearing was unanimous.

Don H. asked if the board had any additional questions. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to accept the application as complete, Mike B. made a motion to accept the application as complete. Howard H. seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

Don H. then asked for a motion to approve the lot line adjustment. Mike B. made a motion to approve the lot line adjustment submitted by Ron Lackie, Mill Street, Woodsville, Mill Street, Woodsville, Map 103, Lot 106 and Eden Aldrich, Map 402 lot 35. The motion was seconded by Howard H. The vote to approve the lot line adjustment was unanimous.

Eden A. asked what else has to happen to get the lot line adjustment complete. Ed B. said a mylar has to be submitted, along with the recording fee, then signed and recorded. He said Harry B. is aware of the next step.

Interim Town Manager Jo Lacaillade pointed out that the adjustment won't be reflected unit next year's tax bill because the adjustment was approved after the April 1 deadline.

Don H. invited Harry B. up to the table again to present a lot line adjustment for Ron Fadden Map 206 Lot 110 with Dave Patten Map 206 Lot 113.

Ed B. asked if Harry B. had made any changes to the plat since submitting it for review and he said he had. Ed B. turned the plats he had in the file back to Harry B. and Harry B. distributed new plats for the board's review, indicating they changes were minor and housekeeping in nature.

Mike B. asked the record show that Tara K. had joined the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Harry B. explained that Ron F. wants to add .19 acres behind his home to his lot from David Patten's property. Harry B. said the project was the same as presented last month and the application basically seeks to extend the lot line between the two properties to Hazen Drive. He explained the Patten lot is L-shaped with about a quarter acre tucked behind the Fadden's home. The adjustment would annex that small parcel into the Fadden's property. Harry B. said there was once a house on the small piece in the back.

Don H. asked for a motion to go into public hearing at 7:20. Mike B. made the motion which was seconded by Tara K. The vote was unanimous.

Don H. asked if there was any one in the public that wanted to make a comment. Jo L. indicated she was almost an abutter, but had no issues with the application.

Mike B. made a motion to come out of public hearing at 7:22 p.m., Tara K. seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

Ed B. said the application had been warned, the abutters notified and the application appears to be complete.

Mike B. made a motion to accept the application of Ron Fadden, Map 206 Lot 110 and Dave Patten Map 206 Lot 113. Tara K. seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

Don H. asked for a motion to approve the application. Mike B. made a motion to approve the lot line adjustment between Ron Fadden and Dave Patten. Tara K. seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

Don H. invited Harry B. to present his next application, a two-lot subdivision on Dickinson Road. Harry B. said he was representing Wanda Fiano, the applicant. He said Wanda F. wants to do a subdivision of her property. He said she had originally thought of making a four-lot subdivision and using a long right-of-way to access the property. Harry B. said at the time, the board told Wanda F. that she would have to upgrade the road to town specifications. He said the right of way is 75 feet wide so the road would stay out of wet areas. Since the applicant was before the board previously, the applicant and her family have been constructing a road and a house with a well and septic system. A decision was then made that the family did not want to build a road to town specs. Harry B. said there is an existing driveway to the second lot in back to the 30-acre parcel. The applicant would like to give the back parcel to a son so he could build a house on the lot. Their idea of creating four lots on the property has been abandoned, Harry B. said.

Don H. asked if the driveway is accessed by Dickinson Road. Harry B. said it was. Don H. said that unless the back 30 acres was further subdivided the driveway to access it would work.

Mike B. made a motion to go into public hearing at 7:25. Tara K. seconded it. The vote to go into public hearing was unanimous.

Tara K. asked if the application had been warned. Ed B. said it had been warned and the abutters have received notice as well.

Harry B. reminded the board it was a minor subdivision and both lots had road frontage on Dickinson Road.

Ed B. said he wanted to point out two things about the application. First, point is both parcels are irregularly shaped and both can be further subdivided in the future.

Don H. said lot 2.1 is the oddest of the two and he can understand why. It's because the applicant had carved out a 75-foot right of way. Tara K. said the division doesn't make the lots any worse than they already are. Don H. said the applicant needs to know that further subdivision would require the road be built to town standards. Tara K. pointed out the applicant could make two lots on the rear parcel off the driveway. Ed B. said that's allowed because of the so called "Friel amendment."

Harry B. said the back lot doesn't lend itself to being two lots and the family want to keep it as just one lot

Tara K. made a motion to come out of public hearing, seconded by Mike B. The motion passed with a unanimous vote and the hearing closed at 7:30.

Ed B. said the application had been warned and the abutters were notified. He said the application looks complete. Don H. said the application looked good to him as well.

Mike B. made a motion to accept the application of Wanda F. as complete, which was seconded by Tara K. The vote to accept the application was unanimous.

Don H. asked for a motion to approve the application. Tara K. made a motion to approve the minor subdivision application of Wanda Fiano at 176 Dickinson Road, Map 418 lot 2.1. Mike B. seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

With the public hearing and applications completed, Don H. asked the board's permission to skip to new business. There was no objection.

6. Correspondence/Communications

Ed B. said he has received the outline of a lead abatement project on Church Street from the state. He said the board has no need to get involved with the project, or review or approve it. The application was sent to the planning board as an information piece that just alerts communities to their projects in case there is a step the state has to make at the local level before work begins. The board members reviewed the paperwork from the New Hampshire Division of Historic Resources.

Ed B. said he doesn't think the notice needs any planning board action but asked if the board member thought it did. No board member said it needed any action.

7. Reports of Committees

None

8. Pending Business

Don H. said the board is continuing to review the subdivision regulations and had invited the highway advisory committee to attend, which included Joe Maccini, Road Agent Stuart MacDanolds, Darwin Clogston and Jo L. Don H. said the committee was invited to attend the meeting to discuss any changes or requirements should be included in the subdivision regulation update.

Darwin C. asked when the last time the planning board had considered a subdivision with a road. After some discussion, the board agreed it was likely Fieldstone Estates, which is off Benton Road, not far from Windy Ridge Orchard.

Don H. said the board had left off at 4.5.1 road standards in its discussion of review of the subdivision regulations.

Don H. asked if there were any changes in the dead-end street requirements as presented in 4.5.1.2.

Darwin C. asked about grandfathering and how it fits into the subdivision regulations and any review that may be occurring. He said he lives on a dead-end street, Moody Road, which is longer than 500 feet as spelled out in the regulations now. Howard H. said there are many similar roads in Haverhill.

Joe M. said any review or changes would not apply to any existing roads or subdivisions. Don H. agreed and said it's only for new constructions.

Don H. said the last dead-end road the board considered was Benedict's Way and he said he doesn't think the large rotary turnaround is any further than 500 feet from the intersection with Brushwood Road.

Joe M. said he thinks the hammer-head turnarounds at the end of dead-end roads should be larger than 50 feet on each side. He said for fire apparatus and other large vehicles 75 feet would be better.

Stuart M. agreed and said any vehicle with a trailer would likely be 53 feet and could use the extra space.

Tara K. said the current regulation calls for hammerhead turnarounds that are 100 by 50. Joe M. said that's a little tight.

Stuart M. cited some example in town in North Haverhill and Haverhill Corner that were tight. Additionally, he said that any turnaround should be completely clear for snowplowing.

Jo. L. asked Joe M. how the regulation would work. Joe M. said without enforcement, nothing will work as designed.

Don H. asked Joe M. if he thinks the requirement should be bigger. Joe M. said his primary concern is for fire apparatus access. Don H. said North Haverhill's trucks would fit in many spaces now, although some would be tight.

Don H. said the turnaround at Benedict's Way has to have a radius of at least 100 feet. Stuart M. thought it might be larger, like 200 feet.

Joe M. asked Stuart how he felt about islands in cul-de-sacs and turnabouts. Stuart M. said they are horrible and said there should be nothing in the middle. Joe M. said now is the time to state that for the regulations. Stuart M. said from everything he's seen and done plowing and road work wise, a cul-de-sac is nothing but a headache. He said hammerheads work best because an operator can simply plow them without a lot of maneuvering. A wide open cul-de-sac is not bad because it can be cleaned out one way or the other, Stuart M. said, adding that when an island is added in the middle it's horrid.

Joe M. said he could not imagine why anyone would put an island in the middle of a cul-de-sac because it makes it difficult to plow. Stuart M. said they're always landscaped with flowers and rocks which makes it even more challenging.

Joe M and Stuart M. both said there should be no island. Stuart M. said cul-de-sacs now are 100 feet, but if there were no islands, it could be reduced to 75 feet and be efficiently plowed.

Ed B. asked what else should be changed with the hammerheads, if it should be left at 50 feet in either direction or expanded to 75 feet. Stuart M. said a person with a 53-foot trailer wouldn't be able to turn around in a 50-foot hammerhead. He said it would be hanging in the road and be tight. Stuart M. said 75 would allow an operator to get the trailer pulled around straight. Tara K. said then perhaps it should be 75 feet in each direction. Stuart said that would be better.

Don H. said he doesn't understand why islands wouldn't be permitted with a radius of 100 feet. Tara K. said they do look nice. Stuart M. said islands make snow removal challenging. Don H. said he doesn't understand why it is so difficult to plow a turnaround the size of the one on Benedict's Way. Stuart M. said it is not difficult, but he believes that turnaround has a radius of 200 or 300 feet and it's not really a cul-de-sac, it's more of a rotary that is a two-lane road going around in a circle. Stuart said one in Stonecrest in Haverhill Corner is horrible with the trucks. He said it takes about eight backups to scrape and clean the cul-de-sac because it's so small. Hammerheads are easier to maintain, Stuart M. said, adding that cul-de-sacs without decorations and islands in the middle are preferable as well.

Tara K. said it sounds like a solution would be to regulate islands by the size of the turnaround. She said perhaps a cul-de-sac with a radius of 100 feet or less cannot have an island. Joe M. said that makes sense. Tara K. said large cul-de-sacs are unattractive without some kind of island. Stuart M. said if the island was just open grass area, so when the ground freezes, you can let the rear tires run over the open space, rather than decorations and rocks, that would work too.

Ed B. asked if the board wanted to allow islands if the turnaround is 100 feet or more. There was discussion that that was too small. Ed B. asked if 200 feet was better. Stuart M. said perhaps 150 feet would be good.

Howard H. said the size of the island would also make a difference. He said an island the size of a basketball would necessarily be a problem, but one that is 50 feet might be. Stuart M. said crews can work around islands, but it is a matter of ease and efficiency. Ed B. asked if it made sense to measure the one at Benedict's Way, which everyone seems to say works, and make that a standard. Tara K. suggested that if applicants want an island, they will have to have approval of the highway department and road advisory committee. Joe M. said that would also work.

Ed B. said if that's the consensus of the board, much of the language about dead-end roads can remain with the addition of a line that says something about islands need to be approved, in writing, by the road agent or the highway advisory committee. Tara K. said it probably will only come up once every 10 years. Joe M. said maybe not even that often.

Joe M. said having review of islands make sense because the road agent can look at whether the concept will work and how much work it will be to plow and maintain.

Don H. asked that before the board gets too far ahead, is the consensus to leave hammerheads at 100 by 50 feet. There was consensus that it should change to 150 by 50 to give 75 feet on each side.

Don H. reiterated the idea that islands need to be approved in writing by the road agent.

Don H. then moved on to review other sections of the subdivision regulations which required no changes.

After moving through several standard sections. Darwin C. asked about a provision in the subdivision regulations regarding reimbursement for time spent by the road agent to review and inspect subdivisions. He asked if that ever happened. Don H. said he did not think it has.

Joe M. said if the economy gets squared around and a developer decides to do a big subdivision would require some sort of third party inspector because you don't want your road agent spending half a day of every day inspecting road construction. He said the board might want to determine a limit of how much the road agent would do before a private inspector would have to be hired to do the work. Stuart M. said a three or four lot subdivision might be something the road agent could handle and fit in to the normal work load. On the other hand, he said someone who buys 400 to 500 acres and puts in several miles of road, the road agent is going to be there all the time while the road is being built.

Ed B. said there are two ways to quantify a requirement for a third-party inspector, number of units or length of road. He said length of road would probably be the better way to measure the need. Joe M. said the planning board ought to check with other towns to see what they're doing. Joe M. said his point is not having the road agent be caught in a position on having to spend too much time on a project neglecting other work.

Mike B. found language in the current subdivision saying the planning board reserves the right to hire engineers and consultants during the approval process. Joe M said it probably would, but he thought the board still should have some sort of quantifier to indicate when that should happen.

There was general discussion about how to handle this change. There was discussion about the need to do a bit more research on the road length.

Joe M. said there is also a need to get "as-built" road plans from the developers to help with future repairs and maintenance issues. He said they are vitally important and suggested that approval should be withheld until the as-built are received by the town.

Ed B. said withholding approval won't work because no developer, or applicant is going to go to the work of constructing roads and infrastructure without having a definite approval in place. Ed B. suggested that building permits be the trigger, or the incentive to have developers submit as built plans. Joe M. said that was a good idea because that is like a golden ticket and developers

aren't going to build roads to nowhere – they have to build houses on the roads, or sell lots to get their investment back. Joe M. said most developers do them, it's just having the developers get them into the town. Ed B. said it could be another check mark on a building permit to make sure they've been filed.

Joe M. asked if there was a way that individuals could get building permits on unapproved roads. The answer was yes, as it is currently, but they have to go back before the planning board for approval. Joe M. said if that's the case, the town is out of luck because there would be no incentive for the developer to produce as-built plans. He said if no one is allowed to build period.

Jo L. said the wording of the current regulation will need to be changed if that's what the board desires. Additionally, she said the building permits will have to go to the planning board for comment before any building permit is issued.

Ed B. said that's true, but the planning board has no authority to approve building permits. So even if the board said not to approve the building permit because the "as-built" plans were not turned in, the permit could be issued.

Don. H. said the language about not signing and recording the plans could be removed and put in its place a note about requiring a bond that won't be released until the road is completed and the as-built has been turned in.

Jo L. said she can't recall a single bond the town has collected upon—not that the town shouldn't but it's not a current practice.

Joe M. said Ed B.'s idea about the building permit is still the best idea because developers aren't building roads just so they can drive on them, they need to sell the lots and build houses on them. He said if a developer can't build without the as-built plans being turned in, they'll be sure to get those in to the town office quickly. Stuart M. said the bond still could work because money is money.

Ed B. said the bond would have to be substantial to cover the cost of the road and someone could challenge the requirement saying the bond is too big. Jo L. said bonds have been challenged in the past.

Jo L. asked a question about the provision that says approval of a road does not guarantee the town will accept and maintain it. She said it could be confusing to some people.

Ed B. said it is just a notice to the purchasers to say the town is not liable for the maintenance of a private road and can't be held liable if emergency vehicles can't access the property.

Don H. said the board has been putting that notice on mylars of subdivisions on private roads. Jo L. asked if it was being done on all. Don H. said yes, and Ed B. said the board hasn't considered many subdivisions recently.

On a related matter, Joe M. said that when the town accepts a road, the town should keep some money for 4 or 5 years so the town would have funds to fix problems that show up later. He said

it would only apply to pave roads. He asked if the town accepts gravel roads. Stuart M. said the town hasn't accepted any gravel roads and it hasn't accepted Benedict's Way, which is paved, because of a settling issue and a crack.

Howard H. said he'd like to see the stats on road acceptance. He said if the town accepts any roads they have to be built with enough pavement to stand up. Howard H. said the town of Haverhill has been inclined to stretch a dollar so thin that the work done is substandard.

He said when the town accepts roads, he said he thinks it too much work for the road agent to go out and inspect the road and make a decisions. He said the road agent already does the paper work for the driveway permits. Howard H. said it would be better to hire a developer to go out and look at the roads and accept them. He asked Stuart M. what his time was worth per hour. Stuart said probably \$50 per hour when benefits are added in and with overtime, it would be more.

Howard said there needs to be enforcement of the rules and the regulations. Tara K. said it's a good point.

Ed B. said maybe a third-party inspector, hired by the town and paid for by the developers is the answer. Joe M. said that's the best way to go and protect the town.

Howard H. said he would like to see the standards set higher for private and town roads rather than just getting the job done.

Ed B. said setting standards for future roads is what the planning board is doing right now and now is the time to incorporate those kinds of changes into the standards.

Howard H. said people should see the difference between six inches of gravel with three inches of asphalt compared and not checking drainage and what an extra inch or two of asphalt what happens.

Ed B. asked if there's a formula to dictate how much asphalt that each road should have. Joe M. said it's not that easy and each area and each soil types have different requirements. Ed B. said even if the bases are different, he wondered if there was a number for the asphalt that could be incorporated into the regulations.

Howard H. said three inches of asphalt is only good enough for driveways. He said everything else with heavy traffic and heavy trucks should be at least 4 inches. Joe M. said he doesn't know enough about it to day how thick the asphalt should be. He said there are people out there who can tell you. Joe M. said there are places were four inches isn't going to be enough without the right base.

Ed B. asked if there are state standards that can be followed. Joe M. said he knows of no standards. Don H. said there's nothing in the standards about pavement depth. He said it does indicate that roads with more than 200 vehicles per day should be paved. He added it had information about the base and the kinds of materials used.

Ed B. said he's not a road expert, but if anyone wanted to change the subdivision regulations about roads, now is the time.

Darwin C. asked how much difference an extra inch of asphalt would cost to go from three inches to four inches. Joe M. said the cost would minimally be an extra 25 percent, just by the math.

There was discussion about the business park road and how it was built.

Joe M. said there's a difference in the kinds of asphalts that are out there. He said two inch stones are used in 2.5 inch top coat material and the bigger the aggregate the stronger the pavement. He said one inch top coat is not always what you get. He said it's hard to hide a 2 inch stone in a one inch top coat.

Ed B. asked if there was any place to go to get information about asphalt and pavement. Joe M. said UNH Thompson School of Engineering. He said the school would be objective the town should be asking for information about road bases and top coats.

Ed B. suggested if anyone on the highway advisory committee would like to speak to any part of the regulation, now would be a good time to do so.

Joe M. said he had an issue with 4.9 regarding sidewalks. He said the language regarding sidewalks doesn't make sense. He said having a four-foot wide sidewalk, 22 feet from the centerline doesn't make sense. He said the regulations calls for 50 foot wide rights of way but the math doesn't add up. Ed B. said the regulation says no closer than. He asked what needed to be fixed. Joe M. said he thinks it needs to be scaled to the actual pavement size rather than the right of way. More research is needed.

Joe M. also said standards for sidewalks today are five feet wide and they need a two percent pitch toward the road. More research will be needed for the sidewalk regulations. Joe M. said the town also ought to look at a requirement to have roads built in the center of the right of way. There was some debate about whether to have road in the center of the right of way. No consensus about whether to change it.

Joe M. asked the board if they had a copy of a drainage and culvert plan done by Richard Auger an engineer from Hanover done in 1974. He said he would get the town one because he has it.

There was some discussion about water retaining on personal property.

The discussion of the roads concluded. The highway advisory committee members thanked for their assistance.

9. New Business (Applications)

None

10. Other New Business

None

11. Public Appearances (Not Previously Scheduled)

Jo L. said she wanted to comment on a couple of things in the March minutes. She said there was comments made about the T Mobile tower in Woodsville about why the service is not working yet. There was a comment made that there may be some town paperwork holding it up. Jo L. said that is not the case and whatever the reason for the equipment not being active is strictly a T-Mobile issue.

Jo L. also wanted to talk about the inventory sheets that were discussed at the last meeting. She said the town is not allowed to ask about dogs on the sheets. She added that the town voted to discontinue using them in 1980 by a town meeting vote because they were not an effective tool for getting accurate information, even though they would sign under penalty of law. She said the staffing to go through sheets from 3,900 parcels of land was significant. She said after all that work staffers might find a couple of storage sheds not on the assessor's list and it was deemed not an efficient use of time.

Jo L. said the town should enforce building permits, but it's all about time and staffing. Don H. said he thinks the building permits should be given back to the planning board so someone would be able to check up on them. Jo L. said the planning board doesn't have statutory authority to check up on building permits. Don H. asked if Jeff Elliot gets building permits, Jo L. said Jeff Elliot doesn't get permits because he doesn't apply, but that's not the same issue as having someone checking up on issued building permits. Don H. said he knows Jeff Elliot doesn't get building permits because the North Haverhill Precinct hasn't had to sign off on anything. Jo L. said that she is aware that Jeff Elliot doesn't get building permits. Don H. said he should be told to cease and desist. Jo L. said she doesn't disagree. She said the town is aware of it and the town is working on some enforcement issues in Woodsville currently.

Jo L. also wanted to talk about the planning board's discussion about taking back issuance of driveway permits. She said the planning board meets once per month and it would be a disservice to residents seeking to build. Don H. said missing a meeting is not the planning board's fault. He said he doesn't understand how someone doesn't know a month in advance they're going to put a driveway in anyplace. Jo L. said she understands that the planning board might be concerned about drainage issues, but not every place needs a culvert. Don H. said there's a lot of them out in Mountain Lakes that need it but don't have it. Jo L. said the town doesn't issue driveway permits in Mountain Lakes if they are not on maintained roads. She said the board ought to have some consideration for the residents whom they serve and not place a hardship on the residents.

Jo L. said if there's a good reason to not let the road agent handle driveway permits, why would the board want to take them back. Stuart M. said there are some sight issues that need attention too. He said if the planning board wants to make a ruling that every driveway must have a culvert, everyone will. Stuart M. he still doesn't think every driveway needs a culvert.

Howard H. asked Stuart M. if a resident has a driveway culvert and it needs to be replaced, does the town do the replacing? Stuart M. said no and there were state laws saying the town doesn't have to replacement because it provides access to private property.

Tara K. said one of the things that she was concerned about was the building permits they see on private roads which is really lacking in information. She said want to strike a balance between looking at everything to maximize tax dollars and maintain a happy and growing community.

Jo L. said she hears the issues and she knows the town has been missing some. She added that when someone calls in about new building that the town might not know about, the town follows up. She said the town office would attempt to contact the owner or maybe send a building permit application in the mail. She said it's not going to catch everything but it is a goal.

Jo L. also said the assessors go to every house during assessing period and a lot of information is picked up through site visits every five years.

12. Comments of the Clerk

Ed B. said he gave each of the planning board members a copy of a policy handbook for the planning board and asked the members to look it over. He said it's important to do things right and the public is watching and we need to tighten up. Ed B. pointed out one thing in the handbook and that is the chairman, not the clerk is supposed to be making the agendas. Ed B. said he's been doing them for six years and never notice that policy He said he has no problem doing the agenda and would not mind continue to do so, but he wanted to let the board know that it's against the policy Don H. said it only make sense for the clerk to do it. Ed B. said he's OK doing it. Don H. said bringing the chairman into the process is only going to make more work for the clerk because the clerk will have to track down the chairman to do the agenda. Don H. said the policy will be changed next month.

Ed B. said the selectboard has also agreed to allowing him to be an alternate Board member with the proviso that anytime he has to act as an alternate, he cannot be "on the clock" as a paid town employee. Ed said a written agreement will be drafted between the town and Ed B. and then acted upon by the board.

13. Comments of the Planning Board

Mike B. said once the subdivision division regulations are done, the board ought to start looking at the master plan which should be reviewed soon.

Don H. said election of officers was supposed to be held tonight but given the hour, he said it can be deferred to next month.

It was also pointed out that Howard H. doesn't have a planning board binder. Ed B. said he would work on getting him one.

14. Other

None

15. Adjournment/Next Regular Meeting

Don H. asked for a motion to adjourn which was offered by Mike B and seconded by Tara K The vote was unanimous. The meeting concluded at 9:15 p.m.

The next meeting scheduled meeting is May 24, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,
Ed Ballam, Planning Board Clerk