

**Kingston Planning Board  
Public Hearing  
November 29, 2016**

The Chairman called the hearing to order at 6:50 PM. There were no challenges to the legality of the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Glenn Coppelman, Chair  
Peter Coffin  
Chris Bashaw  
Mark Heitz, BOS rep.

Adam Pope  
Carol Croteau  
Ernie Landry (Alternate)

Members absent: Peter Bakie, Rich St. Hilaire, alternate

Also in Attendance: Glenn Greenwood, Circuit Rider Planner; Dennis Quintal, Town Engineer; Ellen Faulconer, Board Alternate/Admin. Asst.; Bill Seaman, Fire Chief

Mr. Coppelman announced that the meeting would be televised this evening; he introduced the Board, adding that Mr. Landry would be a voting member for this hearing.

Mr. Coppelman suggested amending the agenda to move the discussion of the Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance to next week's work session.

**MM&S to move the discussion for amending the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance to next week's agenda.** (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Mr. Landry) **PUNA**

**Environmental Compliance Specialists, Inc.**  
**111 Route 125**  
**Tax Map R10 Lot 2**

Mr. Coppelman explained that this was a continuation from a previous hearing regarding possible revocation of the site plan due to non-compliance. Mr. Wright, owner of the business/property. Mr. Quintal, who reviewed the site on November 28, 2016, explained that he met a new contractor on the site, Mike Melvin. He reviewed his report, dated November 29, 2016 that included photos taken on the site on 11/28/16. While Mr. Quintal stated that a wood post and rail fence has been installed, he added that there has been no progress made constructing the storm water management system since his last report of October 18, 2016; there still are open metal dumpster containers filled with building demolition materials on the site; some of the backyard has been cleaned up; some new gravel added to the surface; there are still machines, parts and accessories, trucks, trailers and boats on the site; a few more trees have been cut at the toe of the slope; more trees need to be cut and the erosion control measures added; hay bales should be staked along the silt fence for stability; all disturbed areas need to be seeded and mulched with straw; erosion control jute matter placed on all disturbed slopes; the owner must monitor the site throughout the winter and spring and employ BMP's needed to control surface

runoff, minimize erosion and prevent sediments from washing into the wetland resource area. His final comment was that the site plan is not done. Mr. Coffin asked if Mr. White had any comments about his plans for erosion control and the status of the site. Mr. Wright said that the contractor had done a good job but he realized that the contractor didn't have the right equipment to do the job. Mike Melvin approached him about doing the work and everyone agreed that would be best. He continued that the work being done by Mr. Melvin had taken longer than expected although he does seem to know what he is doing; he has raised the grade so no rush of water will be going into the gravel area and then he can put the swale in the correct level. Mr. Wright stated that Mr. Melvin will be taking the additional trees out tomorrow and then will start the settling pond; he said this should all be completed within the next couple of weeks. Mr. Coffin said that it seems there are an additional number of trucks and boats. Mr. Wright said that Mr. Melvin would like to occupy the space; he knew that Mr. Melvin was bringing in heavy equipment to do the work but he didn't realize that the other equipment, not essential to the project, was being brought in. He said some of the equipment can be stored indoors at the warehouse; he added that he has put the cart before the horse a little bit as he thinks he should finish the site first. Mr. Coffin stated that the letter sent to him said that new businesses can't move into the site until it is in compliance. Mr. Wright said that Mr. Melvin has another site that he can move the equipment to. Mr. Coffin asked Mr. Quintal how much time and effort would be needed for the additional erosion measures. Mr. Quintal explained that the owner needed to maintain the SWM devices at every storm event so no sediment runs off into the wetlands; a silt fence is in place but more severe weather is on the way; he stated that it would be in the best interest of the site to be done in the next two weeks. <Board note: Mr. Pope arrived at this time.>

Mr. Coppelman explained to Mr. Wright that the sentiment of the Board at the last meeting was that this didn't look good for him; the site hasn't been prepared as it was approved and it has been a long time.

Mr. Heitz stated that during the last discussion, Mr. Wright said that an environmental company, similar in nature to ESCI was occupying space. He asked if this was still the case. Mr. Wright stated that they have an office but they are not in the office; all the equipment is mobile and on-site; he re-iterated that the office is unoccupied. Mr. Heitz questioned that since the last meeting, a full-blown construction company and equipment moved in. Mr. Wright said that the equipment was to finish the site work and then talk about him getting an occupancy permit and moving in. Mr. Heitz thought that it looked like the parking had been expanded as one picture shows an 18-wheeler parked in the area. Mr. Wright said that was done a number of years ago and that it had been approved; the elevation has been brought up to make the grade more level; he brought in fill for that. Mr. Heitz said the erosion control measure have never been installed since 2003.

Mr. Bashaw questioned what, of real substance, has been accomplished on the site since the September meeting. Mr. Quintal said the only thing done was the addition of the fence but that does nothing to help the stormwater treatment. Mr. Coppelman said the storm water management and erosion controls were significantly more important than the fencing.

Mr. Coppelman asked if there were any abutter or public comments. There were none. Mr. Quintal said that he did speak with Mr. Melvin about the silt fence issues and got the impression that he would get right to it. Ms. Faulconer asked Mr. Wright how long it would take Mr. Melvin to move his equipment from the site; she explained that site can't be in compliance while a non-permitted business has equipment and activity on the site. Mr. Wright said he did not know.

Mr. Coppelman said the Board had to decide whether to revoke the site plan or give more time to come into compliance. Mr. Heitz said that the site was approved in 2003 and asked why the Board should give Mr. Wright additional time to come into compliance when 13 years hadn't been sufficient time. Mr. Wright said the business wasn't viable enough at the time to complete the site plan; he said there is no defense for letting it go for this many years; time got away from him; once he was clear there was deadline, last March or April, he started working toward getting the work done. Mr. Heitz confirmed that Mr. Wright was saying that he hasn't been able to get the work done since April. Mr. Wright said he has a clear goal to get this done and will be done very shortly; he has met with Mr. Melvin a couple of time since last week. Mr. Heitz questioned the amount of time if he started tomorrow. Mr. Wright answered that he couldn't imagine that it would take a long time to complete the settling pond and silt fence; they will keep on that and then put the swale in. Mr. Heitz asked if the contractor will start tomorrow and continue until complete or leave for another project before the work is completed. Mr. Wright said that the work will continue; he feels that Mr. Melvin can do that.

Mr. Bashaw said that at the September hearing, the Board couldn't have been clearer about the expectations; Mr. Wright assured the Board that the work would be done by the November meeting and if it wasn't, the Board would wait to revoke at a meeting that Mr. Wright could attend. He stated that no progress had happened from September through October; he added based on this, he was not confident that any additional deadline would be met. Mr. Quintal stated that if the owner and contractor put their mind to it, the work could be complete within a week; additional erosion control measures would need to be done and inspected to make sure there are no problems, that the goals are met and the wetlands are able to be protected in the process. Mr. Coppelman said that the Board is about at the same end point as at the last meeting.

Mr. Coffin explained to Mr. Wright that the Board changed its normal meeting date to a later date so that he would be in Town and able to get to the meeting with the hope that providing additional time would also allow additional time to complete the site. Mr. Coffin continued that he can't see continuing again but the Board is meeting again in one week. Mr. Coppelman said that if Mr. Wright could complete the site within a week's time, the Board could meet with him again next week. Mr. Coffin said that he was concerned that without the "carrot", the incentive goes away. Ms. Faulconer thought that, regardless of the business approval, the property owner was still responsible for stormwater management and the protection of the wetlands.

Mr. Greenwood noted that regarding Mr. Wright's comment of his awareness in March or April, that this particular process started well before spring; Ms. Faulconer stated that it started in August, 2015. Mr. Greenwood expressed his belief that ECSI is a think of the past and no longer a business operating on the site; if the Board revokes the site plan, it brings the site back to a blank page; all development/activity must stop. He continued that the Town could be as

aggressive as it chose to be. He stated that a hurried job to scar the land for a solution that may not be appropriate for the next use may not be the best action; the storm water device was specific to ECSI and may not be for how the site may utilized in the future; if something is finished in a week it makes the site saleable for a specific activity, similar to ECSI. He explained that revocation stops everything as there would be no approved activity for the site.

Mr. Quintal said that the storm water management plan is for the slop features on the property and not necessarily the business; it doesn't matter about the business. Mr. Heitz questioned if that meant that even if the business is vacant, then the storm water management should be in place; Mr. Quintal said that was correct. There were questions regarding the ability to continue with the SWM if the site plan was revoked. Mr. Greenwood said if the plan was revoked, storm water management requirements has substantially changed, and improved, since the approval.

Mr. Wright apologized to the Board; he appreciated the tasks taken by the Board members and recognizes those burdens; he is willing to continue to strive to get this done; he had urged his contractor to get started in his absence but, unfortunately, not enough was done; they will start tomorrow. Mr. Heitz said that it appeared that the contractor spent a lot of his time moving unneeded equipment to the site. Mr. Heitz said that at this point, the Board has no confidence that this will get done; he will not be surprised if the Board votes to revoke. Mr. Wright said that the Board has the right to do that but not in the best interest. He is trying to get it done. Ms. Faulconer said that she is not sure whether the contractor is taking advantage of Mr. Wright or the Town explaining that she is more concerned with the additional non-compliance; at the last meeting, the Board was very clear that no additional businesses had been approved as an activity on the site; having the first non-approved business on the site already was an additional non-compliant item; adding another business brings the site further into non-compliance.

**MM&S to revoke the site plan due to non-compliance with the existing site plan based on the multiple reports from the Town Engineer regarding items not in compliance.** (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Coffin)

Speaking to the motion: Mr. Heitz explained that enforcing the revocation will require a lot of attorney fees, seeking of fines could also result in a bankruptcy; he is inclined to give him an additional week or two, not that he hasn't had ample time but because the other route could be avoided if he could actually get the work done. He encouraged the Board to give him an additional week or two.

**Mr. Bashaw withdrew his motion based on Mr. Heitz's remarks; Mr. Coffin withdrew his second.**

Ms. Faulconer said the Board has two more meetings between now and the end of the year: Dec. 6<sup>th</sup> and Dec. 13<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Pope said he wasn't willing to wait to see any progress until Dec. 13<sup>th</sup>; he wants to see significant progress by the next meeting. Mr. Heitz explained to Mr. Wright that hearing back from Mr. Quintal that 90% of the required work is done by next meeting will be good; hearing only 10% will give the Board their answer on revocation.

**MM&S to continue this hearing to Dec. 6, 2016 at 6:45.** (Motion by Mr. Pope, second by Mr. Landry) (Motion carries 6-0-1 with Mr. Bashaw abstaining)

Mr. Coppelman told Mr. Wright that he came perilously close to the edge this evening; he suggested contacting Mr. Quintal with any questions. Mr. Heitz confirmed that Mr. Quintal will visit the site the day before the Board's next meeting to provide the Board with a report of the activity on the site.

**All American Assisted Living**  
**4 East Way**  
**Tax Map R34 Lot 71B**

George Chadwick, from Bedford Design introduced himself and Steven Humphries, architect and Ben Wells, representing the developer, to the Board. Mr. Coppelman noted that the applicant had been to two previous Boards for approvals; the ZBA for a use variance and the HDC granted approvals for the visuals and aesthetics of the building.

Mr. Chadwick reviewed the specifics of the site: 11.2 acre parcel in the Historic District on the SW corner of Rte. 125 and Main Street; a 58 unit assisted living facility with 112 beds with a memory care unit included. Mr. Chadwick stated that they still needed to go to the HDC for the sign to have those details approved. He continued reviewing the proposal: NHDES AoT permit approved on 10/18/16; the proposed parking plan has 96 paved spaces with a grass area that would accommodate 40 spaces; there is a submitted waiver for the required 136 paved spaces as he proposed that 1 space per unit is sufficient for this type of use. He added that a Conditional Use Permit will be required due to requirements for the Aquifer Protection District; he reviewed the lot coverage requirements which they meet. There was discussion about paving the proposed unpaved 40 spaces; Mr. Chadwick explained that they did not believe those spaces would be used regularly if ever and they were trying to avoid a "box-store" feeling on the site. Mr. Coppelman suggested the spaces could be paved if needed; the intent was to have overflow parking on the site; a CUP would be needed to construct within the 50 foot wetland buffer. The current plan has the utilities out of the buffer however some of the patio and walkway is within the buffer. Ms. Faulconer stated her assumption that stormwater run-off would be addressed with these areas; Mr. Chadwick said they were; there will be no garbage pick-up earlier than 7 AM or later than 7 PM; the landscaping and lighting have been designed to meet the requirements; he hoped that the sign would be approved at the next HDC meeting. Mr. Chadwick briefly reviewed the submitted traffic report and fiscal impact study including the estimated real estate tax and estimated ambulance revenue. Mr. Chadwick passed the description of the building over to Mr. Humphries noting that some of the suggestions from the HDC may not be on the submitted plan.

Mr. Humphries reviewed the plan: 2 story building, 58,000 sq. ft., 32 ½ ft. tall which is in compliance with the ordinance, central covered walkway, downstairs includes the common rooms, some assisted living rooms, the Memory Unit, commercial kitchen facility; he noted that there would be no cooking in the apartments; the second floor is all assisted living rooms; there are outdoor areas and outdoor spaces for the residents; hipped roofs, shingle siding; traditional trim. Mr. Coppelman reviewed the approval regarding the HVAC units; Mr. Humphries confirmed that they will match the siding color to blend into the building which is not currently

reflected on the submitted plan but will be addressed with a note. Mr. Coppelman stated that the Planning Board should see updated plans to match the HDC approval and need to see elevations as part of the submission. Mr. Chadwick showed three views from Main Street (per a previous HDC request) and pointed out areas where the large existing pine trees will remain.

Mr. Greenwood reviewed his comments in his memo but first stated that a lot of work had been put into the plan; although a good plan there were some issues. He continued that a hydrogeological study is necessary per the Aquifer Protection Ordinance due to both the septic systems and the conditional use requirement; he explained that once the Board received it, a third party review is required. Mr. Chadwick stated that this had not been started yet and would like some consideration of a waiver if the Board is going to require this. Mr. Greenwood said that there could be a waiver possibility in the CUP but the requirement in the APO is a zoning issue and the Planning Board can't waive those requirements. Mr. Greenwood reviewed the infiltration and stormwater management noting that all of the infiltration is on-site. He was concerned with the ZBA approval as it was for the "use" but there did not seem to be discussion regarding the density. Mr. Coffin said that while the density issue was not discussed at the ZBA the ZBA approval does site "58 units". Mr. Greenwood continued that the lack of building elevations should be amended and show the other Board's decisions. He stated that the applicant's proposal to "bank" 40 non-paved spaces is allowable per the Planning Board's regulations. Mr. Greenwood explained that the construction proposed in the wetland buffer needs comment and discussion with the Conservation Commission; he re-iterated the requirement of the hydrogeologic study. Mr. Greenwood noted that the Fire Department provided feedback; the Fiscal Impact and Traffic Impact studies should be reviewed by the Planning Board. He pointed out that the well radius is located on property owned by the Town of Kingston. Mr. Heitz asked why Town land would be needed for the proposal on an 11 acre parcel. Mr. Greenwood added that the Department Heads/Inspectors had requested a Technical Review Committee for review of the proposal.

Fire Chief Bill Seaman reviewed his comments to the Board: reiterating the request for a TRC; the applicant needed to submit to SFC Engineering for a life safety analysis; he noted reviewing the financial benefit for calls adding that the expense for the additional personnel, calls, and transport needed to be taken into account; he reviewed Bedford's numbers for a similar facility and while in-line with the information from the applicant, it will bring the Department one step closer to needing 24/7 coverage. He explained that they will have to rely on Brentwood for additional coverage re-iterating that this is one step closer to needing to put personnel in the station at night. Chief Seaman also pointed out that the Town owns the abutting property; he asked the Board to look at the applicant providing access as it may be a possible site for a future Fire Station. He reminded the Board that a previous applicant, Hannaford's, was going to provide access along Rte. 125 to the abutting property. The applicant asked for copies of the comments from the Fire Department and Mr. Greenwood; they had Mr. Quintal's comments.

Mr. Quintal reviewed his comments; he stated that while there were many comments, they were minor items that should be able to be easily addressed. He reviewed 33 comments: structural material for grass parking, CUP within 100 feet, not 50 feet, of the wetlands/designated buffer, surveyor stamp requirements, sheet 2 and others showing a 50-foot buffer, should be 100 feet, protective well radius on abutting property needing an easement, snow storage inadequate,

subsurface disposal not allowed within 100 ft. of wetlands, parking is within the building setback of 100 ft., dumpsters, which can be a potential source of fire, is very close to the proposed propane tanks, Note 13 refers to Town of Salem, reports to DES also need to be sent to the Town, grass swale slope is too flat, Utility note on sheet 6 also needs to be on sheet 20 and note Highway Dept. not Public Works, proposed grades to be shown on sheet 8, provide line of sight and note Driveway Permit required, nitrate setback extends over property line, graphic scale and title block scale don't match, trees can't be planted in drainage swale, trees are shown to be planted on underground electric and next to septic tank, force main to system 2, wrong stationing for underdrains, detail for porous pavement needs long-term maintenance on the plan, outlet structure mislabeled, pipe elevation incorrect, multiple details required re: fire hydrant, etc. on sheet 19 are missing, straw used instead of hay, sheet 26 has spelling errors, stormwater drainage analysis has comments regarding roof drain, treatment swales, drains on west side of building, calculations on treatment swales 23 and 36, Sediment Forebays must be larger, porous pavement calculations are incorrect. Mr. Quintal noted reference to Article 908.16.6 for Storm Water Maintenance and Inspection as there are some requirements that need to be addressed. Mr. Coffin noted that the Sleep Center is shown on the wrong corner on the plan. Mr. Chadwick will supply further information to the Board. Mr. Pope asked about the requirement for the 100 foot setback. Mr. Quintal said it is up to the appropriate Board to determine if the proposal is detrimental to the wetland. He said that it is shown to be a 50 foot setback but currently there is also an impact within the 50 foot setback. Mr. Chadwick said that he will provide a wetland scientist's report. Mr. Heitz asked why a waiver was needed for an 11 acre site. Mr. Chadwick said the state requires no parking within the well radius; he continued that they are trying to keep the development away from Main Street; they could push it up and move the septic around which would move the building and parking closer to Main Street. Mr. Heitz suggested moving the well up front to maintain the radius. Mr. Chadwick reiterated trying to keep the development away from Main Street. Mr. Coppelman stated that the proposal would require an easement from the Town.

Mr. Coppelman asked for public comment.

Stanley Shalett, 3 East Way, thinks this is a valuable asset to the Town but had some concerns. He explained that as a member of the Budget Committee, he was aware of the expenses associated with the ambulance service and suggested that the applicant contract to a private ambulance company. Mr. Shalett stated his concern with the water consumption as he lives about 400 feet from the development and was worried that his shallow well would be affected and possibly go dry; he expressed concern about the wetlands and the buildings encroaching on the setbacks noting that on an 11 acre parcel they should be able to not endanger the wetlands; he suggested that the applicant consider central air so the building does not look like a motel; he is not sure the proposal camouflages the units very well. Mr. Shalett suggested the parking lot be on the other side, closer to Rte. 125 to not add to the noise levels with idling engines. He asked to confirm that East Way will not be used as any type of access to the facility. Mr. Shalett appreciated the role the Planning Board takes as the Town Steward and looking at both sides of the equations; he wants the senior assisted-living facility to become an asset to the Town and not a hindrance to the environment adding that the people of Kingston come first and the need to keep this development from becoming a burden. Mr. Coppelman explained the while he would

like the HVAC outside units to go away completely, the applicant has agreed to have them painted the same color as the siding to blend them in a little better.

Ms. Faulconer reminded the Board about the discussion at the HDC about requiring commercial trucks/deliveries coming on and off Main Street through Rte. 125 and not through the center of Town. Mr. Coppelman suggested a note on the plan.

Further public comment: Mr. Scott Ouellette, 189 Main Street, stated that he has been following the process for this application explaining that they have been prepared and been working with the Boards adding that while not strictly residential, people will live there. He had suggestions for the plan: lighting on-site should be Night-Sky compliant with the color of the lamps being black instead of silver to be less obtrusive; the sign should have “down-lighting” as illumination; the right side of the property needs to have the standard, double-row of arborvitaes shown. He suggested the Board look at the property as this time of year the leaves are all down. Mr. Ouellette suggested adding in some deciduous trees instead of having all evergreen; he agreed with the parking as presented with the amendment of the stabilizing treatment suggesting the Board can review after a year to see if paving is needed, he encouraged latitude for the parking; extend the trash pick-up hours to include deliveries re-iterating the requirement of deliveries coming off of Rte. 125 and not through the center of Town; he expressed concern on any second entrance onto the site adding that going through East Way would not be a good way. Mr. Coppelman said that the sign permit will likely be taken up at the next HDC meeting in case any public was interested and wanted to make any comments. There were no other public comments.

There was discussion regarding accepting the plan for jurisdiction. Mr. Chadwick asked that the Board accept the plan for jurisdiction. Ms. Faulconer asked about the time needed for the hydrogeologic study within the timeframe once jurisdiction was accepted. Mr. Greenwood reviewed the ability of the Board to request an extension; the Board needed to make a decision regarding the hydro. study. Mr. Coffin said he would accept Mr. Greenwood’s recommendation. Mr. Greenwood reviewed the requirements specific to needing it if the septic system daily flow requirements; the proposal is for about 7,000 gallons per day, almost three times the requirement. Mr. Coppelman suggested requiring it especially due to concerns of the abutters for water usage and their wells. Mr. Quintal stated that the plan shows irrigation which would also be part of the study. Mr. Quintal stated that depending on whether the easement was or was not acceptable, if the well had to be moved, it would be a major change and take some time to change the plan; without knowing if the plan and well was adequate, jurisdiction might be a concern. Mr. Heitz said the proposal impacts the Town property encroaching 150 feet. Mr. Quintal reminded the Board that this is land that couldn’t be used in the future. Mr. Greenwood agreed that more than half of the well radius is on Town property. Mr. Pope questioned whether it included snow storage, too. Mr. Chadwick said that he would like to talk with the appropriate people about the easement concern. Mr. Greenwood said that would be the Selectmen, not the TRC. Ms. Faulconer asked if Mr. Chadwick was aware that the septic system needed to be reviewed by RCCD. He was aware so had withdrawn the septic design from the Health Department.

**MM&S to activate the Technical Review Committee for the purposes of this application after the applicant meets with the Board of Selectmen first to determine the well**

**placement.** (Motion by Mr. Pope, second by Mr. Croteau) **Motion carries 6-0-1** with Mr. Heitz abstaining.

Mr. Pope asked about the Board accepting jurisdiction. Mr. Coppelman suggested that, due to the well issue, the Board was perhaps not ready for that. The Board agreed. Timing for the continuation was reviewed with the applicant.

**MM&S to continue to January 17, 2017 at 6:45.** (Motion by Mr. Pope, second by Ms. Croteau) **PUNA**

<Board note: The Board took a brief recess at this time. >

### **Board Business**

#### **Critical Correspondence:**

- Impact Fee Ordinance, 405.7, has contradictory language per Bruce Mayberry, the Board's consultant through emails with the BOS office; the Board approved going forward per Mr. Mayberry's suggestion about removing the first line re: requiring additional legislative action.
- Impact Fee Ordinance: The Building Inspector questioned whether "dwelling units" should be "bedrooms" for additions to existing buildings; concerns with impact due to possible changes with accessory dwellings.

#### **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Greenwood will contact Mr. Mayberry about this issue and report back to the Board for the 12/6 or 12/13 meeting.**

- Plan for Brenda Blake property on North Road submitted by Andy Galloway showing the restoration with attached photos; Mr. Quintal reviewed the history of the site; he said the photos show that the site is stable and the erosion controls are still in place. The Board is fine with the plan showing the full restoration.
- Request for release of the Blake bond; this has been approved once the associated review fees have been submitted and paid out of the bond.
- Bond balance list reviewed
- Invoice from CCM dated 11/7/16 approved and signed
- J and M sales – state form received from DOT – this was not signed pending confirmation of compliance with the approved plan.

#### **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Greenwood will review the site for compliance and report back to the Board at the next meeting.**

- Electronic signs at 68 Rte. 125; email received from Mr. Coffin regarding the ZBA approval as the signs were only specific to that business; he referenced the ZBA approval as well as the sign ordinance requiring the removal of the sign within 90 days of leaving; Mr. Coffin said that you can see that the offices are completely empty; the sign says that they have moved. Mr. Heitz suggested giving the information to the Building Inspector so he can call the business owner.
- Memo re: ZBA meetings with Kalil/Crosby and Regis at 21 Meadow wood Road on Dec. 8<sup>th</sup>
- NHDOT notice of work at Rte. 125/West Shore Park Road for 5.1 miles

- Budget versus actual; Mr. Coppelman briefly reviewed his meeting with the Budget Committee.
- Ms. Faulconer reviewed information re: desktop printer; the Board approved purchasing a new one to replace the existing one.

**MM&S to approve the 10/18/16 minutes as written.** (Motion by Mr. Landry, second by Mr. Coffin) **Motion carries 3-0-4** with Mr. Heitz, Mr. Bashaw, Mr. Pope and Ms. Croteau abstaining)

- Mr. Landry spoke on the notion of going for a grant for a Historic Resources Chapter for the Master Plan. He explained that there are programs/grants available for preservation that require three items. One is being a Certified Local Government; Kingston is one of a few in the State; there needs to be sites in the Town on the National Register; Kingston has these. The next step is updating the Master Plan. The Town has already submitted a letter of interest for a grant for the Master plan and should find out in the next few weeks if accepted. There is a 40% match required which can be done in combination of cash and in-kind services. He asked if the Planning Board was agreeable with this project and able to put some of their grant line funds towards this project. It would start in 2017 and be produced by August of 2018. Ms. Croteau asked the estimated cost. Mr. Landry said that it would probably be about \$6000 for the Town's portion adding that the HDC would add to the amount the Board had. Mr. Coppelman said the Master Plan would be needing an update soon and this may be a good first step. The Board consensus was that this was a good idea; there were no negative comments.
- Ms. Faulconer submitted draft changes to the Bed and Breakfast portion of the Historic District I requirements. She explained that this was due to comments at Envision Kingston and was not necessarily "in-depth" but a way to get the discussion started in case people wanted any changes made for the upcoming warrant. She added the Ms. Morse had not seen any of the changes at this point.

**ACTION ITEM: The Board agreed to add to next week's agenda. Ms. Faulconer will contact Ms. Morse.**

Lynn Merrill offered to bring in photos of what ADU's looked like when the Board reviewed the ordinance at their next meeting.

**MM&S to adjourn at 10:20 PM.** (Motion by Mr. Pope, second by Mr. Bashaw) **PUNA**