

**Kingston Planning Board  
Public Hearing  
February 25, 2014**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:45 PM. There were no challenges to the legality of the hearing.

Members in attendance:

Richard Wilson, Chairman	Ernie Landry
Glenn Coppelman, V. Chair	Stanley Shalett
Peter Coffin	Ellen Faulconer, Alternate
Mark Heitz, BOS rep.	

Also in Attendance: Glenn Greenwood, Circuit Rider Planner; Dennis Quintal, Town Engineer  
Absent: Adam Pope, Rich St. Hilaire, alternate

**Bill Seaman, Fire Chief**  
**Fire Engineer Consult Review**

Chief Seaman explained that he had met with Robert Steward, Mark Heitz and Ellen Faulconer to discuss procedures involving third party review of plans pertaining to Fire Safety Codes with the proposal to bring to the Planning Board. He introduced Jeff Murphy, Fire Engineer with SFC engineering as the professional used by the Fire Department for technical reviews. Fire Chief authority, per State Fire Code for third party review, was explained. There was a discussion about engaging this type of review earlier in the Planning Board review process due to issues that can arise after approval which might cause the plan to need amending. Mr. Murphy explained their process; he stated that they are typically involved in the building permit level but being involved in the Planning process helps determine basic Fire and Safety requirements as the project moves forward; he added that this can help eliminate surprises. *<Board note: Mr. Shalett arrived at this time.>*

Mr. Murphy said that they do reviews in Plaistow, Portsmouth, Hampstead, Brentwood and Hampstead; he explained the procedure used in Plaistow. Escrow accounts and other funding sources were discussed. Mr. Quintal agreed that it is a good idea to start reviewing ahead of time but explained that a lot of the items that would be reviewed for a building project wouldn't be prepared until after an approval was received. There was a discussion about the types of processes being reviewed. The Board discussed how the process of review would begin; it was clarified that the plan being discussed was for review and recommendation, not the actual work required to develop a plan. Financing of the proposal was reviewed; Mr. Murphy estimated a review would average approximately \$1500 to \$2000 which would cover a day to a day and a half of work; the cost is \$120 per hour. Mr. Greenwood noted that Brentwood has used this company for 3 to 4 years; they have a procedure for asking for \$1500 in an escrow account; either Mr. Greenwood or Mr. Crescenti at SFC makes the decision for the review. Mr. Murphy explained his credentials in answer to Mr. Shalett's question.

Mr. Wilson suggested that Mr. Seaman and Mr. Murphy come up with a proposal with a process and fees; Mr. Murphy said that their review is usually concerned with commercial development unless it is a residential subdivision with a concern with items such as multiple cisterns. Mr. Greenwood added that it is very successful in Brentwood. *<Board note: Mr. Heitz arrived at this time.>* The Board discussed hiring procedures.

**ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer will review RSA's regarding contracts; bid solicitations.**

Mr. Murphy explained that in Plaistow, they work on these items at the discretion of the Fire Chief.

**ACTION ITEM: Mr. Seaman will work with Mr. Greenwood and Ms. Faulconer on a proposal and return to the Board.**

**HYW Auto Sales**  
**6 NH Route 125**  
**Tax Map R3-15**

The owner, Habib Rami, is asking for Inspection Plates. The Board had no information regarding the application and invited him in to speak with the Board. It was explained that he leases the property from the property owner, Pierre Maroun. He stated that he was selling cars and wanted an inspection plate; he had been at the location since January. Mr. Wilson stated that he needed to provide the Board with a letter describing the operation on the site and needed a letter from the property owner that stated that he was aware of the proposal. The Board asked Mr. Rami if he had a dealer license from the State as they did not have a copy of it, which they usually get from the State. Mr. Rami said he is leasing the property and Mr. Maroun's license; he will bring in a copy of Mr. Maroun's dealer license they are leasing and information regarding ownership. The Board questioned whether Mr. Rami needed his own dealer plates.

**ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer will get the information from Mr. Rami and call the State regarding leasing of the license; the Board will review at their next meeting.**

**Trendezza**  
**22 Marshall Road**  
**Tax Map R33 Lot 27**

Mr. Wilson suggested that the discussion focus on the hydrogeology reports. Christian Smith of Beals, Associates introduced the applicant's hydrogeologist, Nikki Roy. He gave a brief recap of the current status; he said he spoke with the Fire Chief who said the cistern is good. Nikki Roy explained that they have shifted the previous 150 gpd per bedroom, or 300 gpd per two bedroom unit, to 125 gpd for each 2 bedroom unit which is the new standard for age-restricted living. She explained that they will probably design for a higher gpd but for the hydrogeology study will use these flows. She continued that she focused on whether nitrates would exceed the requirements based on flow direction; in order to deal with local variations, they looked at predicting concentrations and looking at nearest property boundaries, they can meet the 10 mg/l requirements; she added that they also predicted nitrates if an overlapping plume and predicted

the concentration if all of the flow from one went into the other and they are still below the 10 mg/l at the property boundaries. She stated that they will revise the report to reflect the new analysis; she concluded that regardless of the groundwater flow they can demonstrate that they can meet the 10 mg/l requirement at the property boundaries.

Danna Truslow, the Town's hydrogeologist, said she would need to look at the revised report to evaluate these findings. Ms. Truslow stated that she has some issues with the nitrogen results; there was a previous sample done in 2005 that showed no nitrogen and the flow directions; she questions the results in this study and where the nitrogen is coming from and recommends some further testing. Ms. Roy replied that there is no evidence of a nitrate source and suggested that it is just the forest; she couldn't pinpoint a specific source. Ms. Truslow said that she would agree except it is very high compared to normal nitrate so would not be an organic wetland based nitrate; she explained that it would be a nitrate source introduced to the area other than a vernal pool. Ms. Roy said they used the concentration in the model and the septic system can flush the nitrate to it is below the 10 mg/l standard. Ms. Truslow stated that she does not agree with the assessment. Ms. Truslow said that the questions/issues are how long has the nitrogen source been there; it is a very permeable material and how big is the source; how long will the numbers continue to climb; she recommends evaluating if it is a natural source and evaluate what kind it is as it is not logical that it is a natural source; she recommends taking a few more samples adding that when the snow cover is gone, a little more investigation could happen. She added that it is better to proceed with caution.

Ms. Truslow continued with the review by noting that the topography is not based on a USGS benchmark which she said is a requirement of the Town. She said this would be better than using an assumed benchmark. Mr. Greenwood, after reading the Ordinance, confirmed that the USGS benchmark is a requirement.

Ms. Roy said that they are proposing bedrock wells unless DES requires an overburden well on the site. Ms. Truslow said this determination would have some bearing on the site.

Ms. Truslow reviewed the lead testing; she said that some lead was detected, some mid-range samples; she noted that since there had been no ability to look at the site conditions at this point due to the weather, it might be wise to proceed with caution to be able to rule out any accumulations. Ms. Roy said that since the samples tested were lower than DES standards, this is not a site of concern to them; she explained the sampling approach adding that 400 is the limit, none of the tests were above 190. Mr. LaRiviere explained that the samples were based on the slope side and the base where he thinks would have the highest concentration.

Mr. Wilson read the Fire Department comments regarding the Condo. Docs: questions were asked regarding requiring an easement to access the fire cistern from a private road and the responsibility of replacement and repairs of the cistern. Mr. LaRiviere stated his belief that the condo. docs. are clear that any repair is the responsibility of the association.

Mr. Wilson read the Health Department comments: no septic plans have been received and no information has been received regarding septic loading; they cautioned the Board approving any interior plans of the unit without additional Departmental reviews. Mr. LaRiviere said the State

has to approve septic and any conditional approvals would be conditional upon getting a septic approved; he continued that floor plans have not been submitted at this point and would have to meet building requirements.

Mr. Wilson read comments from the Kingston Conservation Commission (KCC) regarding building setbacks, hand-written note about private road not seeming “official”, stamps missing, questions on lighting approval from Chief Briggs, grammar errors, missing LCA’s on p. 5,6,7, questions on changes to walls, culverts, revision box on p. 8 not having been updated.

Mr. Wilson noted the Board had a copy of the State’s driveway permit. Mr. Greenwood said it was typical for condo. docs. to include easement language for emergency vehicles/use. Ms. Faulconer reviewed the condo. docs; she noted specific errors including language saying the Town was accepting and maintaining the road; incorrect address; referencing 2 to 3 bedroom units when the applicant has stated that they will be no more than 2 bedrooms; requiring only person to be over 55. She stated that the condo. docs. do not meet the Town’s regulations at all. Mr. Heitz suggested that since there was so much wrong, rather than review it all, give the highlighted copy prepared by Ms. Faulconer to the applicant. Mr. LaRiviere stated that he just gave the Board a “boiler-plate” copy for the Board to review. Mr. Coppelman noted that he continues to be disappointed by this application; not for the proposal but for the low quality of the application and the inappropriateness of the explanation that the condo. docs were for the Board to review; he added that it was up to the applicant to review the Town’s ordinances and regulations and supply the Board with a document that met those standards. He continued that when the Board asked for the hydrogeology study, the applicant stated that he knew he would need it but was waiting for the Board to ask for it. Mr. Coppelman added that he is now waiting for the applicant to say that the Board has delayed this project when the actuality is that the application was not done appropriately.

Ms. Roy will provide the Board with a revised Hydrogeology Report; Ms. Truslow will review the new report; the applicant will bring in the revisions to the condo. docs. by next week.

**MM&S to continue to March 18, 2014 at 7:30.** (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Mr. Landry)  
**PUNA**

#### **Board Business:**

Mr. Wilson told the Board that Virginia Morse, Chairman of the HDC, brought him a letter to review regarding the Bed and Breakfast warrant article; she asked whether the Planning Board would like to co-author the letter supporting this article; copies of the letter were distributed to the Board.

**MM&S to authorize the Chairman (Mr. Wilson) to sign on behalf of the Planning Board.** (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Mr. Coppelman) **Motion carries 6-0-1** with Mr. Heitz abstaining.

**Fitzgerald Boyd Law, PC**  
**Montana Realty Trust**  
**17 Jericho Drive**  
**Tax Map R5-8-30**

Mr. Wilson distributed both letters (dated 11/22 and 2/18) received from Mike Cuomo. Tim Lavalley noted that he had received the draft letter from Mike Cuomo this afternoon. He noted that Mr. Cuomo left a couple of answers for the Board to make. He referenced a comment that the 4K area on lot 8-30 did not meet the requirements as it is too close to the well; he said he had already answered this in an earlier response to the Board by showing a new well location on both the existing and proposed lots. He continued that Mr. Cuomo leaves a couple of questions as whether or not the lot should include areas of soils that are over 15%; he referenced the ordinance and soils suitable for development with cases of areas over 15% the Board may require more area. He said that in this case there is a large gravel hill and if the 15% is a sticking point with the Board, they can level it. He said that if there was a lot that was all 15%, perhaps the Board should ask for 90,000 or something like that but to have little inclusions and little hills, that happens, but if a sticking point, they can go in with a machine and flatten it out and eliminate the 15% slopes to make the issue go away. Mr. Lavalley stated his belief that Mr. Cuomo's letter is a good one although stuck on the new well location and the 15% slopes but he feels that he has proposed two lots that meet today's requirements. There was a question as to whether the State should review the plan again due to the wetlands filling; he referenced State rule Env-1005 to explain not needing that review as the filled wetlands are shown with the characteristics today. He stated that they have added an addendum that they can meet setbacks to the old wetlands lines for both proposed dwellings and feel they have a viable subdivision plan. Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Lavalley if he had any comments about the documents regarding the filled wetlands on the site. Mr. Lavalley said that they are holding the setbacks from the original filled wetland line; Mr. Lavalley said none of the paperwork says that the lot could not be further subdivided. He continued that he felt they met the Board's concerns. The January 9<sup>th</sup> plan submission was confirmed as the up-to-date plan. Mr. Wilson asked if he had the minutes from the July 26, 1991 Kingston Conservation Commission discussion of the filling of the wetland; he read excerpts of the minutes. The subdivision plan addendum, dated Dec. 31 were reviewed; Mr. Lavalley said that it is not part of the plan set but a separate plan showing that they can meet the setbacks. Mr. Wilson read from the minutes of July 20, 1999 that was a previous denial of this lot's proposed two lot subdivision that included seven reasons including a reference to the KCC letter of July 26, 1991 regarding the illegal fill; the minutes reflect a comment from Marilyn Bartlett that a condition of the original Jericho Drive subdivision was that this lot would not be subdividable ever. Mr. Lavalley stated that it was nice that she said that; they meet the setbacks from the old wetland line; he is confused with what is Mr. Wilson's question. Mr. Wilson said that a statement that says that this lot could not be subdividable ever is not a suggestion. Mr. Lavalley questioned who made the statement; Mr. Wilson answered Marilyn Bartlett at the July 20, 1999 meeting. Mr. Lavalley asked why she would be an authority. Mr. Wilson stated she was a Planning Board member; Ms. Faulconer said Ms. Bartlett was on the Board at the time of the original approval. Mr. Lavalley said that if that was what the Board was hanging their hat on, he wanted the Board to vote on this now. Mr. Wilson continued reading statements including Ms. Eadie commenting on the illegal fill with an arrangement with the owner that the property would not be subdivided. Mr. Lavalley said there was no such arrangement. Mr. Wilson said the

comments were reflected in the minutes. Mr. Lavalley said that it may be in the minutes but he wanted to see the arrangement and which owner made the arrangement. Mr. Heitz asked if there was anything recorded at the registry; Ms. Faulconer said it was originally back in the 80's; the minutes being referenced was one of the times when it tried to be subdivided again. Mr. Coffin said that the reason for the denial was recorded in the minutes. Ms. Faulconer noted that Mr. (Jim) Lavalley was at that meeting. Mr. Lavalley said that those reasons are not on the table, they have addressed them and remapped the soils as they exist today.

Ms. Faulconer asked to speak about a current comment from Mr. Cuomo about the site; she stated that on November 22, 2013 Mr. Cuomo wrote a letter to the Board and the new letter on Feb. 18<sup>th</sup> he says that the Planning Board will have to decide the issue for note 2; she read Mr. Cuomo's comments that proposed lot 8-30-1 does not meet subdivision section 905.5A which requires at least 60,000 sq. ft. of contiguous dry land; she continued reading the letter that stated in Mr. Cuomo's opinion the wetland divides the lot and the uplands on either side of the wetland are not contiguous as required by the ordinance. Mr. Cuomo's letter continued that the ordinance states in the same section that the Board may require such additional area that may be needed for each lot for on-site sanitary facilities or wherever the natural slope of the land exceeds 15%; approximately 7500 sq. ft. of the dry land on this lot has a slope significantly steeper than 15%; even if the Planning Board were to be convinced that the two upland areas on this lot are contiguous, the deduction of the steep slope area would leave the lot about 6,000 sq. ft. or 10% short of the dry land requirement. Ms. Faulconer noted that Mr. Cuomo's Feb. 18<sup>th</sup> letter refers back to that comment for the Planning Board to decide if the upland area is contiguous and meets the intent of the ordinance. He added that the Planning Board would also need to decide if the lot area should include those slopes with the slopes over 15%. Ms. Faulconer said it appears that Mr. Cuomo thinks there are two issues with the contiguous land being separated by a wetland and the other issue being the 15%. She said that Mr. Cuomo also references a third issue regarding the 4000 sq. ft. that Mr. Lavalley referenced earlier so that the existing lot is not in compliance. Mr. Lavalley said the existing lot is in compliance, the 4000 (4K) sq. ft. receiving area does make it with the new well location which is common in subdivision plans. Mr. Lavalley said that Mr. Cuomo was asked to look at the soils on the plan and he is trying to do Mr. Quintal's job as well; he suggested that Mr. Cuomo stick to soils. Ms. Faulconer asked if Mr. Lavalley was upset that Mr. Cuomo provided the Board with additional information. Mr. Lavalley said he just provided the Board with another question and the proposed well allows the 4000 sq. ft. receiving area to work. Mr. Lavalley said that his client will level out the 15% slopes to make the Board feel comfortable otherwise they want a decision on the plan.

Ms. Faulconer asked if the Board had determined whether the plan showed perpendicular lot lines. Mr. Coffin said that it had come up earlier in discussion but the Board hadn't answered that yet. Ms. Faulconer said she thought that issue was still in question and whether the Board felt they met the definition of perpendicular. Mr. Lavalley said they were 90 degrees; Mr. Coffin asked 90 degrees to what; Mr. Lavalley said to nothing, nor are they required to be. Mr. Coffin said it is a lot line which is required to be perpendicular; Mr. Lavalley replied that all lot lines are not required to be perpendicular; they are required to be perpendicular from the street. Mr. Wilson said that previous decisions to deny included the issue of not having perpendicular lot lines.

Mr. Heitz asked for clarification; he said that excluding the wetlands, they need the whole property to come up with the 60,000 contiguous soils. Mr. Cuomo's letter says it does not meet the requirements; Mr. Lavalley stated that Mr. Cuomo is saying that is up to the Board to decide. Mr. Lavalley said there is an area that is one foot wide that makes the soils contiguous; it is what makes it. Mr. Heitz says when he looks at that, the Ordinance was to have 60,000 sq. ft. of usable land and to consider usable because you have maybe a one foot connection doesn't seem feasible; Mr. Lavalley says the amount of land on the lot should be totaled and considered adequate for two homes. Mr. Wilson asked about the lot line not being perpendicular. Mr. Lavalley said the lot line is perpendicular at the street; he stated his interpretation that the entire line doesn't have to be all perpendicular, just where it meets the street. Mr. Coppelman said that it did not meet the intent of the ordinance. Mr. Coffin said that only about 1/10<sup>th</sup> of the lot line is perpendicular, at the street not to the street. Mr. Greenwood suggested that the Board make a decision based on the information provided so far; he continued that the lot line issue was brought up by him in his first comment letter to the Board.

Mr. Wilson read from a previous Notice of Decision from 1999 that the denial also included part of the decision being that the lot line was not perpendicular. Mr. Lavalley noted that this was not that subdivision. Mr. Wilson agreed that was true but was making the point that the lack of a perpendicular line had been an issue of denial in the past. Mr. Lavalley re-iterated that they would like to have a decision tonight.

Mr. Coppelman asked to hear from the Town Engineer prior to taking any action. Mr. Quintal reviewed his comments; he added that the portion of the lot with the existing house and the 4K area does not meet the Town requirements, the 4K receiving area is 10 feet off the property line, the Town requires 20; since this is not a replacement for a system in failure but rather for a subdivision, the question is whether this is acceptable to meet the Town's requirements for the suitability of the septic system. He said that this issue along with the 60,000 sq. ft. requirement and the issue of whether there is a one foot distance for contiguous and subtracting off the area of fill that was originally placed on this lot makes it definitely less than 60,000 sq. ft.; along with the steep slope part of it and it the ordinance doesn't say that anything over 15% on the original can be graded off; it just says 15% and it has to be based on the original contours and grades; what the intent is in the regulation is to look at the lot in the natural condition or natural state. He finalized his comments by saying there are a couple of issues that the Board needs to consider prior to making a vote.

Mr. Wilson asked for public comment. Mr. Lavalley responded to Mr. Quintal's comments; he discussed the 4000 square foot receiving area and suggested that if anyone had asked about that before tonight, they would have addressed it; he said that there is plenty of room to draw the receiving area that meets the Town and State rules. He said that he sees now that it is drawn closer than the 20 feet setbacks but there were other areas that could be used; the requirements can be met. Ms. Faulconer confirmed that the current plan did not show it as conforming to the Town's regulations; Mr. Lavalley agreed adding that he wished it had been brought to his attention sooner. Mr. Quintal stated that upon his review, he does not think that it can meet the 20 feet lot line setback without impacting the 100 ft. wetland setback; he does not believe they can meet the Town's requirement. Mr. Lavalley said they are not asking for any waivers or special treatment for the 4K receiving area. Mr. Lavalley said that they can use the 15% soils. He

re-iterated his previous comment that if there were large areas of 15%, the Board might consider requiring more. He believes the 15% to be a non-issue unless the Board says it is.

Mr. Wilson returned to public comment. Andy Rusnock, abutter, stated that he had submitted letters clarifying his objections to the proposal and asked to clarify one key point for the Board to consider. He said that the key fact before the Board remains that the 60,000 sq. ft. of contiguous soil cannot be met without including the 3,750 sq. feet of illegal fill; he added that the documented intent of the KCC and the Planning Board has always been to not disrupt the wetlands further by removing the illegal fill; if this should be allowed to be included in the 60,000 sq. ft. either for setbacks or contiguous dry soil requirements then the illegal fill will do what was intended when initially filled which is to create a second buildable lot on wetlands. He continued that if it had been required to be removed back in 1991, then there wouldn't be the possibility of having 60,000 sq. ft.; the intent of leaving the fill was to not disturb the wetlands further; the intent to not disturb the wetlands further will be significantly worse if the grading occurs and a housing unit is constructed; if the subdivision is accepted, the exact actions for the illegal fill will have been rewarded 20 years later, this is exactly the opposite of what the KCC is charged with the and the Board has supported. Mr. Wilson noted that he was going to read his letter into the record but it was just summed up; Mr. Rusnock agreed.

Mr. Coppelman stated that after all this, he doesn't see any reason to come to a different conclusion than that reached by previous Boards; the requirement for the 60,000 sq. ft. of dry contiguous uplands is not met. He stated that he would be making a motion to deny the application. Mr. Coffin stated that he would second the motion; he re-iterated Mr. Quintal's confirmation that without the area of the filled wetlands included, the 60,000 requirement could not be met and the contiguous requirement is not met nor is the intent of the regulation met; the Board has received expert testimony of this from Mr. Quintal and Mr. Cuomo. Mr. Coppelman stated his intent to amend the motion. Mr. Wilson asked the motion be re-read. Ms. Faulconer stated that the motion at this point is to deny. Mr. Wilson would like to add that the intent of the previous Boards, specifically from the KCC to not subdivide the property, was clearly the intent. Mr. Wilson clarified that the reasons to deny could be ascertained from the Board's discussion.

Mr. Coppelman clarified that while his original discussion referred to the 60,000 sq. ft. of dry buildable land but also that the Board has discussed the issue of the perpendicular lot lines and while the lot line starts out perpendicular at the lot line, once into the lot a little bit, it is not and this does not meet the intent of the ordinance. He would like this included as an additional item in his motion to deny. Mr. Coffin agreed adding that he felt there was also an issue raised by the Town Engineer that the required 4,000 square foot area can't be met on the original lot. Mr. Quintal re-iterated that he does not believe it can be met. The Board discussed the items for the motion adding that the minutes and other documentation will also reflect the Board's discussion, concerns and reasons. Mr. Greenwood advised that the substantive reasons for denial should be included in the motion: He reviewed Mr. Coppelman's comment regarding the 60,000 sq. ft. not being met, the intent of the perpendicular side line not being met, he recommended the Board include the council provided by Mr. Cuomo in his letter of November 22 regarding the additional 6% of steep slope that would further challenge the 60,000 sq. ft. requirement; he suggests at least those items. He noted that he understood Mr. Quintal's concept of the location of the 4K area because the Board would then be creating a non-conforming lot when trying to re-subdivide so



he suggests that should be included as well. Mr. Wilson questioned adding information regarding previous reviews and denial; Mr. Greenwood said the premise is that if this lot could have been two lots it would have been done by the owner in 1985.

Mr. Coppelman amended his motion:

**MM&S to deny the subdivision based on:**

- **The requirement for 60,000 sq. ft. of contiguous, dry, buildable land cannot be met.**
- **The intent of the requirement for perpendicular lot lines cannot be met.**
- **Approximately 7500 sq. ft. of the dry land has a slope significantly steeper than 15% as noted in the review by RCCD.**
- **4,000 sq. ft. receiving area can't be met on the original lot.**
- **The Board was also swayed by arguments made by previous Boards regarding previous subdivision proposals.**

Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Coffin. **Motion carries 6-0-1** with Ms. Faulconer abstaining.

**Board Business, continued:**

Mr. Greenwood stated that he received an email from Attorney Loughlin regarding condo. docs. at Hawks Ridge (Diamond Oaks). Ms. Faulconer confirmed that the Planning Board had not received this email. He stated that Attorney Loughlin had made some incorrect assumptions that he wished to discuss with him. He asked the Board's permission to contact Attorney Loughlin; he will ask Attorney Loughlin if this is public information, if it is he will send to Ms. Faulconer to send to the Board for their review.

**MM&S to authorize Mr. Greenwood to speak with Attorney Loughlin; check if this correspondence is public information.** (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Landry) **PUNA**

**Action Item: Mr. Dufresne will be contacted when this issue is being added to the agenda.**

**MM&S to request Hawks Ridge (Diamond Oaks) applicant to increase the Bond back to \$1000.** (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Landry) **PUNA**

**Correspondence:**

- Building permit for garage/storage shed at Hawks Ridge (Diamond Oaks); Mr. Greenwood reviewed and he meets the requirement for expedited review; the Town's well radius requirements need to be amended on the plan. Mr. Dufresne will provide the Board with 12 copies and Ms. Faulconer will add to the agenda for expedited review which does not require abutter notification.
- Letter re: Salon taking place of Barber Shop at Kingston Plaza; the Board does not require any further review pending approval of the Health Department; a groundwater permit may be required by DES. If there are no issues with these approvals, the Board has no issue to review.
- Invoice for Danna Truslow approved

**Action Item: Ms. Faulconer to contact Trendezza to bring their bond back to \$5000.**

- Memo received from Building Inspector re: shutting down Saddle Up Saloon (Pondview) as building without any permits.
- Letter received from Keith Dias re: In-home occupation; no action required by the Board.
- Reviewed SRSD request re: ad-hoc committee; Notify them that Glenn Coppelman has volunteered as the Planning Board's representative.
- The Board cancelled the meeting scheduled for March 25, 2014.

**MM&S to approve the January 28, 2014 minutes as written.** (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Mr. Landry) **Motion carries 5-0-2** with Mr. Heitz and Mr. Coppelman abstaining.

**Plan Review:**

Application from Franma (Mark Heitz) pending ZBA review; added to March agenda.  
Application from Trendezza added to March agenda.

**MM&S to adjourn at 9:35.** (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Landry) **PUNA**