

TOWN OF TEMPLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE PLANNING BOARD

NOVEMBER 4, 2009
FINAL MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

Board members present: Richard Whitcomb, Bruce Kullgren, John Kieley, Allan Pickman, Rose Lowry

Call to order by Pickman at 7:30 p.m.

1. TEEC – energy chapter for Master Plan: TEEC members present: Beverly Edwards, Gayle Richards, Honey Hastings, Mary Pendleton. Edwards stated the proposed energy chapter had been created to make recommendations to help the town reduce greenhouse gas emissions and save on energy costs. Edwards talked briefly about the content of the document and then asked the PB members for their thoughts. Kieley stated the Master Plan is a guide for the town and said the report could be more user-friendly. One recommendation was to move the charts and graphs to a separate appendix. Pickman stated his concern for content appropriate for the Master Plan. He said he does not feel it is the purview of the PB to mandate energy efficient construction, as there is a state RSA for building codes and existing state energy enforcement. He also expressed doubt that major transportation and density issues could be facilitated with a zoning change. Edwards said the points made were interesting and urged board members to imagine a different town in the future. She referred to having a more inviting and useful village, which could help reduce driving. There was discussion about rural living and how residents routinely have to leave town for goods and services. Whitcomb wondered if the idea of having a town center would ever come back, and suggested one change might be to promote people working at home, i.e. telecommuting. Kieley noted one aspect to be worked one was to expand the internet communication infrastructure throughout the area. Other comments include shortening and refining the document, reducing the introduction, and using a bulleted list of objectives similar to the template of the existing Master Plan chapters. Edwards said all comments were helpful and the chapter would be re-worked on and eventually presented in a public hearing. Kullgren spoke up and expressed concerns about telling people what to do, referring to the phrase “...limiting development” on page 5. He noted that the town is aware of Smart Growth directives, that current zoning allows ‘sprawl’, and that developers and builders are energy conscious. He indicated more constraints are not necessary. There was further discussion of growth and transportation, with reference to regional planning issues. Lowry urged the group to think about the future, consider policies for long-term good, and let the people of the future choose. Kullgren said his point of view represents freedom to choose, while Lowry’s expresses an ideal. Edwards thanked the board for their consideration.
2. Ellis/Odell subdivision: Pickman presented a review of his research of deed references and lots relating to the property owned by the Odell family. It was his opinion that the property in contention is a separate lot of record, and incorrectly portrayed on the town tax maps as part of map 2 lot 60. He stated surveyor Earl Sandford had reached the same conclusion, and appears correct in terming the plat “corrective”. Pickman stated that under current zoning that land is an acceptable building lot and should be approved as such. Lowry moved to accept the corrected plat, second by Whitcomb, and voted in the unanimous affirmative with the exception of Kullgren recusing himself as an abutter. It was noted there is no need to hold the subdivision hearing scheduled for November 11th, and the application checklist items no

TOWN OF TEMPLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE PLANNING BOARD

NOVEMBER 4, 2009
FINAL MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

longer apply. Sandford will be notified of the decision so he can proceed with producing a Mylar for recording. It was noted Ellis will get money back from subdivision fees paid.

3. Salera subdivision: Mike Salera had asked the board to discern whether a 14-lot subdivision plat he recorded in 1971, prior to town zoning regulations, is grandfathered. According to LGC attorney Paul Sanderson, the answer is probably "no" under the vesting language of RSA 674:39. The board discussed the language of the statute and the circumstances of the plat. Kullgren asked when state subdivision regulations came into effect, and wondered if Salera's lots would fall under the state code if it were in effect at that time. Kullgren then questioned if an unapproved plan falls under the authority of RSA 674:39 at all. He continued that it could be a question of timing of the subdivision vs. implementation of zoning, and asked that the date of posting of the first hearing for town zoning regulations be determined. A question of current use penalty (L.U.C.T.) timing was also raised, should the subdivision be determined to be valid and then lots are sold or developed. Sanderson will be contacted and asked to provide his opinion in writing, and to answer the several questions raised during this meeting.
4. Sub-committee reports: No information available yet on either home business or workforce housing. Honey Hastings said the zoning board is interested in a joint meeting to discuss details of possible changes to zoning
5. Review of minutes for meeting of 10/21/09. Move by Kullgren to accept as written, second by Lowry, and voted in the unanimous affirmative.

Move to adjourn by Kieley, second by Pickman, and so voted. Meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Betsy Perry