

Planning Board Meeting Minutes  
Town of Brookfield, NH  
267 Wentworth Road  
Brookfield, NH 03872

**Thursday, October 15, 2015**

- I. Chairman Rick Surette called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.**
- II. Roll Call: Members, Alternates, Appointment of Alternates per RSA 673:11,673:12**
  - A. Members present: Chairman Rick Surette, Vice-chairman Rob Collins, Jim Freeman, Ed Comeau, David Champy II and Selectman Rich Zacher.
  - B. Tardy: Jim Freeman and Dianne Smith.
  - C. Alternates present: Dianne Smith.
  - D. Members and Alternates absent: Geary Ciccarone, and John Merrigan.
- III. Appointment of Alternates per RSA 673:11, 673:12.**

No alternates were present at the start of the Planning Board meeting.
- IV. Public Comments.**
  - A. At 6:32 PM Dianne Smith entered the Planning Board meeting area. Chairman Rick Surette appointed Dianne Smith as an alternate to Jim Freeman.
  - B. Chuck Robbins requested some clarity regarding a locus map and vicinity map as required in the Rules of Procedure.
- V. Announcements/Correspondence/Mail.**
  - A. Chairman Rick Surette announced the following:
    - 1. The latest copy of *Town and City* would be made available in the public office.
    - 2. An advertisement inviting Planning Boards to join the American Planners Association.
    - 3. An invitation from the DOT to attend various meetings regarding transportation projects.
    - 4. Chairman Rick Surette announced that the public hearing originally scheduled for October 15, 2015 regarding a lot line adjustment was rescheduled to take place on October 29, 2015.
  - B. There was some discussion as to the necessity of rescheduling the Lot Line Adjustment Public Hearing resulting from notification errors.
    - 1. Vice-chairman Rob Collins questioned whether the Rules of Procedure had been followed or if perhaps a procedural insufficiency had been exposed.

2. At 6:39 PM Jim Freeman entered the Planning Board meeting area. Chairman Rick Surette appointed Dianne Smith as an alternate for Geary Ciccarone, reinstating Jim Freeman as a voting member.
  3. Selectman Rich Zacher suggested that since the Planning Board administrative assistant is also the Assessor Clerk, “another set of eyes” may be necessary to insure the verification of abutters.
  4. Chairman Rick Surette requested that the administrative assistant provide some historical context as to what led to the postponement of the public hearing. The administrative assistant explained that the procedure of verifying abutters was followed and no discrepancy was found as far as delivery to the appropriate addresses. However, a technical error was discovered after an abutter notified the Assessor Clerk that the mailing label of the notification displayed their sir name instead of their corporate name. Although notification took place, this information prompted the Assessor Clerk to verify proper owners’ names with the abutters’ map and lot numbers as supplied by the applicant. During this research the Assessor Clerk discovered seven instances where spouses who were listed as co-owners were not included on the mailing labels. While each incidence may count as proper notification since mailing went to the appropriate addresses, the Assessor Clerk notified the applicant and the Planning Board Chairman of the discrepancies and suggested that a remailing may be necessary to reduce the risk of a legal challenge. After the applicant received advisement from various sources, he decided that a new notice would be in order, necessitating a postponement of the public hearing, a reposting, and a new publication notice.
  5. Chairman Rick Surette requested that the administrative assistant place the amending of the Rules of Procedure on the November Planning Board agenda.
  6. Vice-chairman Rob Collins asked by what means the new publication notice and remailings were being paid. The administrative assistant responded that Chuck Robbins, the applicant, graciously insisted upon paying for costs incurred by the resubmission.
- C. There was some discussion in regard to an alternate who was not attending Planning Board meetings. Chairman Rick Surette volunteered to approach the alternate who was not attending meetings to request a letter of resignation.

## **VI. Review and Possible Approval of the September 17, 2015 Meeting Minutes.**

- A. A draft of the September 17, 2015 meeting minutes was distributed to Planning Board members.
- B. **Motion: Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to accept the September 17, 2015 minutes as written.** Second: Jim Freeman. The motion passed unanimously excepting one abstention.

**VII. New Business-**  
(None).

**VIII. Old Business-**

A. Driveways

1. A document supplied by Selectman Rich Zacher proposing to amend the Zoning Ordinance in regard to driveway regulations was distributed to Planning Board members (attached).
2. **Motion: Selectman Rich Zacher made a motion that the Planning Board accept the document to propose changes to the Zoning Ordinance as a working document.** Second: Ed Comeau. The motion passed unanimously.
3. Chairman Rick Surette read the working document to those in attendance.
4. Jim Freeman introduced discussion regarding the necessity of driveways providing a means for safety and emergency vehicles to gain access to properties by providing proper weight capacity and accessibility.
5. The following were proposed changes to the working document;
  - a. In item 1 place a space after “12’ ”.
  - b. In item 3 delete “for ambulance, pumper and tanker”.
  - c. In item 6 replace “Houses located” with “Driveways”.
  - d. Presently regulations can allow for more than one house to be accessed by one driveway.
  - e. There is a definition of driveways in the Subdivision Regulations but not in the Zoning Ordinance. Selectman Rich Zacher suggested that the definition of driveway in the Subdivision Regulations be added to the Brookfield Zoning Ordinance.
6. **Motion: Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to add a space after “12’” in item 1 of the driveway working document.** Second: Ed Comeau. The motion passed unanimously.
7. **Motion: Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to add to the beginning of item 2 of the driveway working document the following words “The travel portion of the driveway shall have an”.** Second: Dianne Smith. The motion passed with five members in favor and one against the motion.
8. **Motion: Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to delete “for ambulance, pumper and tanker” from the end of item 3 of the driveway working document.** Second: Selectman Rich Zacher. The motion passed unanimously.
9. **Motion: Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to delete “Fifty feet is preferred” and replace “design to” with “shall” in item 5 of the driveway working document.** Second: Dianne Smith. The motion passed unanimously.
10. **Motion: Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to replace “the structure” with “any dwelling” in item 5 of the driveway working document.** Second: Dianne Smith. The motion passed unanimously.
11. **Motion: Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to replace all words in item 6 of the driveway working document with “The driveway shall provide a staging area within 1000’ of any dwelling for multiple emergency vehicles.”** Second: David Champy II. The motion passed unanimously.
12. Selectman Rich Zacher requested that the definition of “staging area” be discussed at the next regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting.

13. **Motion:** Selectman Rich Zacher made a motion to replace all words in item 7 with “Driveways that exceed 500 feet shall have a turn around within 250 feet of any dwelling”. Second: Vice-chairman Rob Collins. The motion passed unanimously.
  14. **Motion:** Selectman Rich Zacher made a motion to add the wording in items 6 and 8 of the “Minimum for Private Roads” document to the driveway working document. Second: Chairman Rick Surette. The motion passed unanimously.
- B. Proposed Parameters for Approved Private Roads.
1. A document supplied by Selectman Rich Zacher proposing to amend the Zoning Ordinance in regard to private roads was distributed to Planning Board members (attached).
  2. **Motion:** Ed Comeau made a motion that the Planning Board accept the document to propose changes to the Zoning Ordinance as a working document. Second: Jim Freeman. The motion passed unanimously.
  3. Chairman Rick Surette read the working document to those in attendance.
  4. **Motion:** Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to replace the introductory paragraph with the words “A private road shall meet the following minimum standards:” in the private roads working document. Second: Chairman Rick Surette. The motion passed unanimously.
  5. **Motion:** Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to replace “thirteen feet, six inches (13’ 6”);” with “fourteen feet (14’);” in item 4 of the private roads working document. Second: Jim Freeman. The motion passed unanimously.
  6. **Motion:** Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to delete “culverts kept clear of obstructions;” in item 7 of the private roads working document. Second: Chairman Rick Surette. The motion passed unanimously.
  7. **Motion:** Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to replace “insure” with “ensure” in item 9 of the private roads working document. Second: David Champy II. The motion passed unanimously.
  8. **Motion:** Ed Comeau made a motion to replace “vehicle that is” with “vehicles that are” in item 5 of the private roads working document. Second: Vice-chairman Rob Collins. The motion passed unanimously.
  9. **Motion:** David Champy II made a motion to add an item 10 to the private roads working document that states “Private roads must meet life safety codes, DES, and shore land protection regulations. Second: Vice-chairman Rob Collins. The motion passed unanimously.
  10. **Motion:** Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to insert at the beginning of item 3 of the private roads working document “The travel portions and shoulders of private roads shall have an”. Second: Dianne Smith. The motion passed unanimously.
  11. Vice-chairman Rob Collins suggested that on page 5, IIA3c of the Zoning Ordinance the word “approved” should be deleted before “private” and on page 42, in definition “Y” replace “approved street or road” with “class 5 or private road”. Chairman Rick Surette decided to place the suggestion on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting.
- C. Amended CIP
1. A copy of the amended CIP was distributed to Planning Board members (attached).
  2. The administrative assistant reported the changes to the spreadsheet displayed on the CIP document. After some discussion the following was decided;
    - a. the cost listed for “Town Cemetery” should be changed from \$50,000 to \$20,000.

- b. The line item “Roof Town House/School/Offices” shall be deleted.
- c. The line item “Shared Office Equipment” shall be deleted.
- d. The administrative assistant volunteered to update the CIP document accordingly.
- 3. Chairman Rick Surette requested that the administrative assistant amend the CIP document to include additional roads as submitted by Selectman Brian Robischeau.
- 4. Vice-chairman Rob Collins introduced discussion regarding the requirement of a Public Hearing according to number 5 on page 2 of the CIP document. After some discussion the following was proposed:
  - a. **Motion: Vice-chairman Rob Collins made a motion to delete number 4 on page 2 of the CIP document and replace “November” with “October” and delete “(holding additional public hearings as appropriate)” in number 5 of page 2.**
  - b. Second: Chairman Rick Surette. The motion passed unanimously.
- D. Master Plan.  
Chairman Rick Surette postponed discussion of the Master Plan until the next Planning Board meeting.
- E. Consideration of Organizations Providing Notification of RSA Revisions that Apply to Planning.
  - 1. State Representative Ed Comeau distributed additions to the previously distributed notification of RSA revisions document.
  - 2. State Representative Ed Comeau announced that he had emailed the document that provides notification of RSA revisions in its entirety to the administrative assistant for distribution to Planning Board members.

**IX. Public Comments.**

(None).

**X. Member Comments**

(None).

**XI. Adjournment**

At 8:58 PM the Planning Board meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by  
George Nick, Administrative Assistant.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date 10/21/15

**Driveway:** A private way that serves not more than two (2) lots and provides vehicular access to any street or private road and must meet the following specification

1. Minimum width of travel portion of driveway of 12' with 2' shoulders.
2. All weather road surface and base capable of supporting 43,500 pound GVW vehicles with 27,000 pound rear axle load.
3. Minimum horizontal road curve centerline radius of 40' for ambulance, pumper and tanker .
4. Turnoffs every 500' or less if sight lines require.
5. Driveways designed to allow fire apparatus to park within a maximum of 100' of the structure. Fifty feet is preferred.
6. Houses located more than 1,000' from a town highway should provide a staging area within 1,000' of the house for multiple emergency vehicles.
7. A suitable turn-around should be provided so that emergency vehicles do not have to back down to exit the driveway.

Sub-Division Regulations Article XII page 17 and under building lot requirements

**MINIMUMS FOR PRIVATE ROADS**

After inspecting private roads and upon input from the Fire Department, Road Agent and Police Department regarding of the need to accommodate emergency and other vehicles, the following are the minimums for private roads to insure use by emergency and highway vehicles and equipment in a safe and expedient manner:

1. Width of traveled way: sixteen (16) feet, minimum;
2. Road shoulders: three (3) feet, minimum;
3. All weather road surface and base capable of supporting 43,500 pound GVW vehicles with 27,000 pound rear axle load;
4. Minimum overhead clearance (branches, limbs, wires): thirteen feet, six inches (13' 6");
5. Provide turnaround area at dead end roads to accommodate vehicle that is thirty- five (35) feet in length;
6. Grade roads to eliminate crown over six (6) inches;
7. Provide adequate culverts where required (culverts minimum twelve inch in diameter); culverts kept clear of obstructions;
8. Provide that all grades and changes in grades can accommodate a thirty-five (35) foot long vehicle;
9. Provide that all sharp turns, curves and blind areas to insure a thirty-five (35) foot long vehicle can safely negotiate the roadway.

Town of Brookfield  
Capital Improvements Program  
2016 Budget Year  
Approved November 20, 2014

## Background and Purpose

A Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is a decision making tool used to plan and schedule town improvements over a period of six years or more. It is a statement of a town's intended schedule for the construction, expansion or replacement of public facilities and equipment that have an appreciable life expectancy such as schools, libraries, and highway equipment. For Brookfield, a capital improvement has been defined as an item costing at least \$5,000 and having a useful life expectancy of at least three years. Operating expenditures are not included in this definition. It is a principal goal of the CIP to increase the predictability and regularity of the Town's budget by planning for routine or anticipated major expenditures and determining appropriate methods for meeting the Town's capital needs. While the CIP should be used as a guide for the municipal budget process, it is an advisory document only and not a strict set of guidelines. The responsibility for preparing the annual town budget remains with the Selectmen, with the final approval for appropriations made by the voters at Town Meeting.

## Authorization and Requirements

New Hampshire RSA 674:5-7 provide legal guidance regarding authorization, purpose, description and preparation of the CIP. Brookfield authorized the Planning Board to implement the CIP by passing warrant article #12 in March 2001.

According to RSA 674:5-7, there are required elements and optional elements in the CIP.

A CIP "shall" do the following:

- Address capital improvement projects over a period of at least six years. It can be a longer period, of course, and 6-10 years is typical in many municipalities.
- Classify projects according to the urgency and need for implementation.
- Include a timetable for implementation of projects.
- Take into account public facility needs that are indicated by the development shown in the Master Plan or which are permitted under the municipality's zoning ordinances and regulations.

A CIP "may" include the following:

- Estimated cost of each project.
  - Probable operation and maintenance costs.
  - Probable revenues (if any) from each project.
  - Suggested funding sources.
-

Process/Schedule

The CIP process is updated annually by the Planning Board.

1. Summer - The Planning Board collects proposed capital projects and supporting information from the various departments, boards, commissions, committees, etc.
2. August - The Planning Board reviews the recommendations of the Master Plan in relation to the capital improvements program (required by RSA 674:7).
3. September - The Planning Board organizes and prioritizes these projects and creates the CIP working document.
4. October - The Planning Board holds a public hearing to gather public input and feedback.
5. November - The Planning Board finalizes the CIP (holding additional public hearings as appropriate) and formally approves the CIP.
6. After the CIP has been formally approved, the Planning Board forwards it to the Office of Energy and Planning (RSA 674:9) and to the Selectmen (RSA 674:8) to aid in their creation of the proposed budget. The final budget is determined by the legislative body at Town Meeting.

Funding

The financial projections presented in this CIP represent the “worst case” scenario, in which town tax appropriations must pay for all projects. It is anticipated that the cost of some projects may be partially or fully offset by grants or may be funded by other means.

Projects

The following table summarizes the proposed capital projects and an appropriation schedule. The “urgency” column represents the Planning Board’s understanding of the urgency and need for implementation of the project. The “cost” column represents the project’s estimated total cost. The year columns refer to budget years and the values represent the appropriation to add to the capital reserve fund(s) to support that particular project in that budget year.

Project	Urgency	Cost	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Archives	Medium	\$6,000			\$6,000			
Roof Town House/School/Offices	High	\$20,000	\$20,000					
Paint Town House/School	High	\$20,000		\$20,000				
Restore Town House	Medium	\$425,000	\$898	\$93,488	\$86,724	\$91,808	\$55,544	\$96,538
Town Cemetary	High	\$50,000	\$50,000					
Shared Office Equipment	Low	\$6,000					\$6,000	
Municipal Land Purchase	Low	\$210,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
Moose Mountain Rd	High	\$74,832	\$74,832					
Brice Drive	High	\$32,242		\$32,242				
Stoneham Road (east)	High	\$53,006			\$53,006			
Pike Brook Road	High	\$53,922				\$53,922		
Stoneham Road (west)	High	\$84,186					\$84,186	
Clark Road	High	\$49,192						\$49,192
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$1,084,380</b>	<b>\$180,730</b>	<b>\$180,730</b>	<b>\$180,730</b>	<b>\$180,730</b>	<b>\$180,730</b>	<b>\$180,730</b>