

**TOWN OF BARTLETT
PLANNING BOARD
56 TOWN HALL ROAD
INTERVALE, NH 03845
603-356-2226**

**APPROVED MINUTES
PUBLIC SESSION**

June 1, 2026

6:00 p.m.

Present: Scott Grant (Chair); David Patch (Vice Chair); Vicki Garland (Selectmen Representative); Michael Galante; David Shedd; Pat Roberts (1st alternate); Heather Forbes (2nd Alternate)

Absent with notice: Joe Heuston

Absent: Kevin Bennett

Also Present: Burr H. D. Phillips, PE, CPESC Civil Solutions, LLC

Called to order by the chair at 6:00 PM

1. Pledge of Allegiance- led by the chair

2. Discussion of application/new business:

- **T-Mobile Tower Modification (Tax Map 2LHDRH-000WEL-000LOT)-** installation of a generator as backup power. Jeff DelliColli from T-Mobile on behalf of Centerline Communications presented. T-Mobile has an existing site on Mittenwald and right now they are in the process of what they call hardening projects which is adding backup generators to keep the cell site operational during any type of power outage or any type of emergency situation. They have been doing this across most of

the sites in New England and across the country to make sure cellular customers have their service when any type of power outage takes place. Michael Galante asked about noise and what powered the generator – gas, propane or oil? Jeff DelliColli answered it is a diesel generator, and it comes with a sound attenuator and steel enclosure around the motor itself. It runs about 65 decibels which is equivalent to a vacuum cleaner. The generator is about 7 feet away from the site. During a power outage I am sure other people will be running a generator so there will be ambient noise around. Vicki Garland commented that if people had to chose between cell phone service or a little bit of noise the cell service wins. I imagine it is short term correct? Jeff DelliColli answered correct once the power comes back on the generators are remotely controlled from the network operating center so once power comes back on the generator just shuts down itself. Pat Roberts asked if they self test. Jeff DelliColli responded yes- it runs weekly. They can schedule it and adjust it at any time. It usually runs around Tuesdays at 10 am exactly as a cycle test. Heather Forbes asked if there is a notice put out to neighbors within a certain mile radius of this change going into place? We have had neighbors of cell towers come before the board before with concerns and wanting to be kept abreast especially of large changes like the towers make larger or what not. Do you ordinarily send something out to the community members? Jeff DelliCollie answered it depends on the bylaws but since this is a minor change that is taking place on the ground and not visible to the public and they are not extending the height of the tower or adding equipment on the tower itself there was no notice. Vicki Garland added that the change would be documented in the minutes that is made available to the public. Jeff DelliCollie added that is correct and if approved they will be applying for a building permit. Scott Grant commented that was

why Jeff was here so they could get a building permit. The board has to determine if a public meeting needs to occur. He asked Jeff DelliColli if T-Mobile owned the tower on Alpendorf or is that Verizon? Jeff DelliColli answered he was not sure of that. Scott Grant asked what was the size of the generator? Jeff DelliColli answered it was a 48-kilowatt generator and it can run 7 days straight then it needs to be re-fueled, it takes about 200 gallons. The tank is a double-walled tank so it has leak protection, and leak notification. There is theft protection because it is inside the fenced in compound. The cell site itself uses basically what a normal household uses for power about 200 amps or 120 volts. Vicki Garland made a motion seconded by Heather Forbes. Board voted unanimously to approve the request and send them to the Selectmen's office to apply for a building permit without a public hearing.

- **Cedarcroft Farm LLC (Map 1THORN/Lots 54L00 and 42L00)-**
Continuation of project: Cedarcroft Farms LLC subdivision of the property owned by Cedarcroft Farms Tax map 1THORN lot 54L00 into the 33-unit PUD. Andy Fisher (Ammonoosuc Survey) is unable to attend. He asked for the following statement to be read into the minutes "HEB has redesigned the Turn-Lane and we are now waiting for the DOT to look it over and get back to us. We hope to have their approval soon." Motion made by David Patch seconded by Heather Forbes. Board voted unanimously to continue the project till the July 6, 2026 meeting
- **Jason Brown (Map 2RT302 Parcel 161L00, 165L00 and 170L00)-**
Continuation of project: update regarding application. Andy Fisher (Ammonoosuc Survey) is unable to attend. He asked for the following statement to be read into the minutes Nothing to report. We anticipate work continuing now that spring is here. "We will update the Board as there is anything substantive to report." Motion made by David Patch seconded by Heather Forbes. Board voted unanimously to continue the project till the July 6, 2026 meeting.

- **AMSCO (Tax Map 5STLNG Parcel 000G00)**- subdivision of Block G (Phase 1) in Stillings Grant- extension of Cave Mountain Rd and 1 lot for system pump storage tank (for now). Continuation of project and update on application. Alec Tarberry from AMSCO presented. Alec Tarberry explained to the board that they are working with DES on the stream crossing and basically, they are looking for us to minimize wetlands impacts. We have been working with them to figure this out and what they are looking for. I think what is going to happen is we are going to basically be putting in a box culvert and we are trying to figure out how to make it work. Scott Grant asked if all they are waiting for is DES approval? Alec Tarberry responded basically yes but what DES wants us to do does not work with the town road standards like a retaining wall in the right-of-way. We had a long meeting with Burr on Friday via Zoom and received some good guidance from Travis Chick and hopefully we will have it all figured out by the end of this week. David Patch asked if Greg Howard was still working with AMSCO. Alec Tarberry responded yes, he did soil science and we are relying on his data essentially to show where the wetlands are. The tricky thing is we are using an alteration of terrain permit from 1989, and I was not sure how this would work. What we are learning is with DES having an alteration of terrain permit is not basis for putting a road in a certain place. They are saying that you would minimize your wetland impacts if you moved the road 100 feet south. We replied it would require us starting basically over the engineering and their reply is you can't use an alteration of terrain as a reason to approve your wetlands disturbance here. Of course, moving the road 100 feet south would make it steeper and so it would be less compliant with the town road standards. They say we can approve of this if you can demonstrate that this is the best way to do it, balancing what we want plus what the town of Bartlett wants. We are just trying to navigate that. Pat Roberts asked if the 100 feet was the actual number? Alec Tarberry responded it was more like an example. He added that it is frustrating and if anyone had been there the stream is not even a stream- if you look now, it would be wet but in a month it would be dry. David Shedd added that a month ago Henry Shaw was before

the board and stated that the only hold up was the change of the culvert from 4 to 6 feet. Is this the same place you are referring to? Alec Tarberry responded yes and added a month ago that was where we were. We had just done the call with DES and it looked like we needed to do a box culvert, and we went through the different options. Verdantas has been showing us different things that seem to balance everybody's needs and we figured out what we thought was the best option we reached out to Burr. When we send things back to DES, we have to wait 30 days for them to get back to us. That is their statutory limit, and they usually ask for more time because they are so short staffed. So we decided to get feed-back from Burr and Travis for the past few days and we think we have it nailed down. Burr Phillips added that the town's road standards don't allow retaining walls within the road right-of-way. One of the plans show to me from DES resulted in a 22 foot high retaining wall in the road right-of-way like 10 feet off the edge of the pavement. Travis Chick added we do not want any part of that and I went to Gene Chandler to ask his opinion on this and he concurred that there cannot be a retaining wall in the right-of-way. They have to go back to DES and explain that the town will not allow a retaining wall so hopefully they are allowed to push the retaining wall back out of the right of way but that will increase the wetlands' impact. Alec Tarberry explained they may actually apply for the waivers and get denied and then take these to DES and say- Hey we tried- it seems they are looking for something concrete from the town. David Shedd asked in terms of timing you had a May 19th deadline from DES and basically, they said if you needed additional time you had to reach out and you needed to contact them before the deadline. Are you on schedule with DES as far as meeting their time requirements? Alec Tarberry responded that yes there was a Zoom call and then there were notes. I could forward this to you but basically in the Zoom call they said "Hey, let's agree to stop the clock on the timing, and say we both agree that we agreed to stop the clock." David Shedd asked if there were any items from the Army Corp of Engineers that is causing a hold up? Alec Tarberry responded that they are sort of a partner of DES and I really do not know how to describe

their role. I guess they don't have specific regulations, they just want us to minimize wetlands impacts. David Shedd stated that Henry Shaw brought up at the last meeting that the number of lots has been reduced from 40 to 37. Does that make sense to you? Alec Tarberry responded that phase one is 18 lots and I believe the second phase is about 20 so I think we landed at 38 lots. Scott Grant asked if they lost one lot due to the water tank. Alec Tarberry responded yes we did but we got that back because the tank will be way up high. Alec Tarberry continued the plan he had was for the 18 lots. David Shedd asked Alec Tarberry to forward to the secretary any updates that show the number of lots in total went from 40 to 37 lots just so the board could see what changes are being made because he had only seen the original map with the application. Alec Tarberry was able to find a map of the lots and gave it to David Shedd. Alec Tarberry added the map was preliminary because it has not been finalized yet and it still shows one lot as a tank lot. If you include the tank lot the total is 21 lots and a grand total of 39 lots. David Shedd clarified that the tank was going on common land as was previously discussed and there was no problem with that. But he asked if a whole lot was taken away in order to put the tank up high? Alec Tarberry responded that their plan was to take the lot labeled as tank lot and sell it. David Shedd asked if there was a special lot created for where the tank was going? Maybe a BLA was needed at the top of the lot if more space was required for the tank. Alec Tarberry voiced understanding. He added that they re-drew lot lines because we wanted to have every lot be a minimum of an acre. My dad had this design and there were some lots were a lot smaller but then we figured out how to do it and still get the 21 lots there. Scott Grant asked about the conservation wetlands in the front of the development and asked if that had anything to do with this box culvert and stream issue. Alec Tarberry answered no but in a separate but related topic on the mitigation side we are going to be going with a bigger conservation easement and writing a check to get that through. Vicki Garland clarifies it was the state's request because the town accepted the mitigation plan. Alec Tarberry responded affirmatively. He added that they basically

came back and said they wanted to mitigate the wetlands that are disturbed. There are different types of wetlands, and they want us to exactly match the number of wetlands disturbed placed into conservation. So, with this many linear feet of stream you have to find exactly that kind of stream wetlands to mitigate. Everyone we are working with on this project is like I have never seen them do this before and I am saying it's like a conspiracy theory or something. It seems it was going to be relatively straight forward because we have tons of common area that is already set aside. What we have learned is that for whatever reason their preference these days is the check and in the old days it was mitigation. Now they say they really want the check because if you write a check they don't have to go through all that work of reviewing your detailed mitigation plan, it is just a lot easier and faster. Scott Grant asked what do they do with the check? Burr Phillips explained that the logic behind it is when they were doing all these little easements and those things that were not so valuable from a wetlands perspective, because you have all these little things all over the place so they take the check and then award grants to do a significant wetland restoration or project. Then that bigger project has a lot more value than adding up the individual little specs along the way. There is some logic to what they are doing. Scott Grant asked if that would mean buying someone's property that had wetlands and wanted to sell? I am curious about this stuff and wanted to know where the state goes to find out about this stuff like the wetlands and who owns them. Burr Phillips replied that he thought there is a grant application period and people will come in with proposed projects and they want to do some sort of wetland restoration or fix something. DES then weighs the project, and they score the projects to figure out which one will provide the most value and then assign that person to it. An application advertisement goes out to do these and there are non-profits and environmental people that want a dam or want to remove a dam and then the money is assigned to whatever will do the best. Michael Galante stated that someone is penalized until they write a check. Burr Phillips explained that in most cases it is things that occurred before regulations went into place but they

are not environmentally good. Michael Galante added that he understood it to be we are not asking you to fix the problem just write a check. Burr Phillips responded that DES could say don't fill the wetland and that is fixing the problem from their perspective. Instead of shoehorning in something on a small piece of property that may not have very much value let's pick a project that got a lot more bang for your buck. It is good use of the money by writing checks on the smaller projects so the bigger area and wetlands can be protected. So they pool a bunch of checks together and do a big project. Alec Tarberry added he felt that DES is probably looking at this project and saying you guys are putting all this stuff into conservation land that can't be developed anyway so just give us the money. Scott Grant asked if the land downlow that went to conservation also applies to DES for wetlands even though it is not going to be developed. Am I correct in saying that? Alec Tarberry responded that basically what we are saying is we are putting this into conservation land so that it can never be developed. I say it couldn't be developed but technically if the HOA board decided they wanted to work with the developer and develop it I guess they could figure out a way to do so. I don't know if it would be houses but in theory it could be but by putting in a conservation easement it definitely can't be. David Shedd voiced a couple of questions partly out of concern that some of the problems we are having with Block F are going to get carried into Block G due to the way things are designed. One of the issues is the question of the bond. We are still working with the Selectmen to decide whether to divide the bond between the road and the water line and then the Selectmen take care of the financial aspect of it. I personally prefer we do not give up oversight of the water system. I do not know if the Selectmen wanted that anyway. One of the things that Henry Shaw said at the last meeting was that this is AMSCO until we are bonded then we takeover. I guess the question is and you don't have to answer but who is paying the bond? Alec Tarberry said he would be happy to answer- Rotten Rock is paying the bond. There is nothing to hide here. The deal we cut with Rotten Rock is we are becoming partners. We are supplying the land, the engineering and the approvals. Rotten

Rock is providing construction and infrastructure, and we split the proceeds of the land. It is a little more complicated than that but that is the gist of the agreement. Scott Grant added that we should continue under AMSCO because that is who made the application. He wanted to make sure that nothing would be changed with this partnership. Alec Tarberry expressed understanding stating that we have not actually inked the deal yet- it is basically a handshake until we get our approvals then we ink the deal. Scott Grant added that he could see a problem going forward but it would be negated if AMSCO sold the project to Rotten Rock. However, it is all about the legitimacy of who applied for the permits to subdivide and then you get approval- it is all about protecting the company. Alec Tarberry again voiced his understanding and added that AMSCO will still be there, and he would be on the hook if things go south or something. David Shedd continued that one issue we were having before was the building permit issue anticipating one from Hannah Spector in Block F. I am not sure if you are aware, but the request came in and I believe the Selectmen signed it. It would not have been fair to her to own the land and not be able to build a house- I believe the Selectmen were right in granting her the permit. One thing we discussed a few months ago was that this requirement for a building permit was going to be on the deed or on the plan. Do you have any objection to it being on both? Alec Tarberry responded that he could not think of any reason why it would be an issue. David Shedd continued that one of his concerns was when the water line was approved, I remember reading something about an occupancy permit. We are saying you cannot get a building permit until the water line is approved. I would hope that we don't get to a point where someone thinks they can get a building permit but not an occupancy permit. I would like to get this straightened out before we finalize this because I can see how someone wants to get pushed ahead. David Patch clarified that anytime we have a restriction on anything it goes on the deed. If anyone wants to know something they go down to the county seat and look it up. David Shedd asked if there was any problem to it being on the plan also or is that too complicated? David Patch added no but

that is a decision we make here. Burr Phillips clarified that it is usually on the subdivision plan then the lawyer drafting the deed picks it off the subdivision plan and puts it in the deed. So, if you want something on the deed show it on the subdivision plan. Jim Wilson (Stillings Grant HOA president) spoke and stated that the lots in F and Hannah Spector that water approval is a sperate entity and it is being modified. The restriction that was placed was because of us (the HOA) because we own the system and we got the approval. We want a letter from Alec stating they agree to all the conditions but the conditions apply to Block G not Block F and we can't supply water to anyone until DES comes and inspect it, the system is essentially in place and just as a practical matter all the fire protection and everything else (including the modifications that have to be made) to make the system work. All the work in the original subdivision and on Parker Ridge and the renovation and the pump stations have to be done to make the system work. They put the last caveat in so that we are not allowed to give anybody water till the system was operating and inspected by DES (first time he has ever seen that) and approved. David Shedd added that was where the occupancy permit showed up. Jim Wilson concurred that maybe we are not allowed to have it occupied but he expressed he really did not know. Water is important- if we don't give them water then they are not going to build a house without water. There is no allowance for wells. But the Block F thing is an entirely different matter because it is not complete and Alec had a five-year deal of which he has already used three years to allow water to four or three houses and it is kind of a screwy deal with a pressure booster. It is only in one house right now because there is only one other house that is on the t block right now but the clock is ticking on Block F and if this thing falls apart Alec has a lot of work to do. He has to put a pump station in and he has some things to do along with the cul-de-sac and paving. Block F is not complete with the water- it is working but we have one member up there Hannah Spector would be the second. He voiced uncertainty regarding this whole thing about occupancy but the HOA is not bound to give water until the system is complete and that is what gets our permit. David Shedd

added from the board's perspective that I don't want to get two years from now into that argument as to whether it is an occupancy permit or a building permit. I would hope that we would be clear that no building permits are issued until the water system has been tested and approved. Do you have an issue with that? Jim Wilson answered he did not have a problem with that, but it is a timing issue. It depends on what Rotten Rock does- there is a lot of modifications they have to do. They have to reverse the flow of water on Stanton Farm Road and Cave Mountain Road or Cave Mountain Drive and with the reservoirs there is a lot of work to be done before you start filling the new tanks. He added that he really could not see a scenario where that would happen but if it did the HOA would have to say no. Pat Roberts asked if the occupancy permit is the end phase of the building permit? Vicki Garland clarified they are two separate things. First comes the building permit. Pat Roberts added that you cannot get an occupancy permit without having a building permit in your possession? Board responded that the work must be done also. Scott Grant added that the occupancy permit is all about taxation and oil inspections- not if you have gas/propane. It is all about making sure you are 100% done and coming in and looking at the house saying it is worth this and that is what you get taxed for. He asked if that was the sequence and the board answers yes. Pat Roberts asked if the septic plan was checked and Vicki Garland added that a building permit is not issued unless a septic plan had been filed. Alec Tarberry added that the board was trying to avoid a scenario where someone starts building a house while we are still under construction with the road and the water and if we didn't get it done and all of a sudden they are saying "Hey I got this house and I have no water what the heck is going on here." It is a problem for everybody and I totally understand. I am totally fine with saying no building permits until we get everything done and you don't have to worry that I will flee. Jim Wilson asked for clarification that they were asking about the water system- not that the pavement isn't quite done or whatever. He was made aware that the pavement and paving of the road is the Selectmen's purview. If the water system is in and DES comes

and inspects it and likes it and everything is done according to plan there may be no problem with us giving them water. Pat Roberts asked if the Selectmen were okay with the road short of paving? Vickki Garland responded as long as heavy equipment is going up and down, we did not see the sense of paving the road. She added that Gene Chandler was confident that the bond covers that last piece so the town or the townspeople won't get stuck. David Shedd asked if Alec Tarberry had been in to discuss with the Selectmen about bonding the road yet? Burr Phillips responded they spoke to the Selectmen about 6 months ago. David Shedd stated that at the end of the meeting he was going to ask the board about being able to speak to the Selectmen and decide how we arrange this bond for water. I would prefer that the bond is in two pieces that there are two separate bonds, but the town takes care of the payment for both. I don't the Selectmen would choose to have oversight over the water system- I think the road is enough for them. I would like to vote on that, but we don't need to. Do you have any issue with the bond being in two pieces and having the Selectmen take care of the financial aspect of it? Jim Wilson answered he does as it was the business he used to be in. This is a chunk of money and as the work starts getting worked off the bonds maybe the road is ahead of the water and if all hits the fan now all of a sudden you have these two bonds and maybe they have been worked down. If you don't have enough on the water side but you have enough in total to finish the project. When you split it like that then you are saying this is the water project and that's it- you don't have the pool of money to cross back and forth. It doesn't matter you can make all the water items line items and being that these guys are financing it privately and it is not a public project the schedule of values will be used by Burr to look at for bond reduction. It is not like the town went out and borrowed all that money but not having the pool of money is a lot bigger insurance policy then having two because if they get out of whack and something happens it won't pay. Vicki Garland responded that they have had this discussion before possibly with Burr that someone explained that when the bond is written it is not a vague thing it is well delineated and that everything that

needs to happen so it is specific- this is the water side this is the road side. Burr Phillips explained there is a lot of line items in the bond for each element but the fact of the matter is it is not perfect. None of the individual items are perfect- you do the project one day and get a set of numbers, if you do it tomorrow there may be a different set of numbers. What Jim is saying is the more broad you make the whole bond if it is a little low over here but this one is a little high you are safer with your bond and you have a little more money to work with, and it is a bit safer. I agree with that. Vicki Garland asked who is that safety for – is that protecting the town? Is it safest for the town to keep one bond? Burr Phillips replied yes, the town always wants to have as much money as possible and that is in their best interest as it gives you a little extra cushion. Vicki Garland asked if it is accurate to say that it works better for the town, the people of Bartlett, to have one bond instead of two? Burr Phillips responded he thought it does but if someone has any objection to that way he would do two bonds. David Patch clarified that no matter how this washes out the only people who can be responsible for the finances are the Selectmen. We do not have any right to do any financial business- it is the Selectmen. Nobody else is allowed to spend or make a financial deal other than the Selectmen. David Shedd asked to step back to Block F for a bit- added we spoke about this before and last month. You think there is enough money in the Block F bond to cover if things do not proceed into Block G- is there really enough money to finish Block F? I don't think so partly because costs have increased and the pump house does not show up on the cost projection from 6 to 8 years ago. The pump house is not even there so I don't want the Selectman reducing the bond in Block G and find out it was a lot more expensive than we thought. He asked if we are required to reduce the bond in general? David Patch answered we cannot because we are not in charge of the financial aspects of it. David Shedd added he would like to think the Planning Board could work together with the Selectmen. David Patch answered he was sure that was correct but when all is said and done, we cannot reduce or not reduce the bond and the Selectmen are the only ones that can make that

decision. We can have a joint meeting to discuss whatever issues are going on and I am sure they will listen. David Shedd added that the one good thing about not reducing the bond is they will keep going because they want to finish. Jim Wilson added that this is the actual reason for the bond because if you buy it for a year it is an insurance cost and if you have to renew it and if the bond is not reduced it will be the full price again. At that point Alec may come in and say that is not fair because some of the work has been done and then a negotiation happens. Vickki Garland explained the Selectmen get a letter asking for a reduction in the bond and then the Selectmen go right to Burr and ask him if this is reasonable request. Jim Wilson added then Burr will go out to the site and look at each line item on that schedule of values and the contractor may say they want 50% reduction, but Burr may say it is more like 40%. Then there may be a negotiation. Burr Phillips explained that Sheila Duane had asked for a reduction in Block F to \$180,000 and he met with Dave Miller to review the site. They calculated the list items and came up with \$330,000 and when presented to the Selectmen they decided that the reduction was to the amount of \$400,000. That was how the reduction in Block F went, but you are right the pump station was not listed, and it is separate from the road. The bond is just covering the road. Motion made by David Patch seconded by Vicki Garland. Vote unanimously to continue the application till July 6, 2026

- **Master Plan-** Continued discussion by board regarding changes and modifications. Pat Roberts asked if the appropriate departments – police, fire etc.- been made aware that the board is updating the master plan? Vicki Garland answered the police department has been notified and the fire department is not quite ready to take this on but will be soon. Secretary explained that Adobe was updated and so she will add the sewer warrant in the appropriate location.

3.Review and approve minutes: May 4,2026 Motion made by David Shedd seconded by Michael Galante vote unanimously to accept the minutes as amended.

4.Administrative Report

- **Glen Aggregates** – Update from chair Scott Grant. He called Sean Shannon and had a long discussion regarding the board's and individual concerns. He understood and he has an excavator but the bucket is being worked on. Scott Grant explained we needed to know what he was doing by July 1st and that was about a month from our conversation. The board would want to come in around July 1st to see what he has done. After this meeting I will get back to him regarding the boards plan. He was amicable about making a couple of cuts in the stump pile. He is crushing right now but he is out of gravel. He would like to grind the stumps for loam and all that stuff. I understand that it is a money issue and a time issue. I also mentioned the back lot regarding where he is getting the dirt from and I said I know you don't want stakes there but you can take your phone and go on an application and it will tell you exactly where the lines are. If you wanted to build a house up there and you move the material off the hill where will the material go? I explained if he wanted to save his time and energy to come to the Planning Board or the Planning Board from inspecting the pit since it is our responsibility to take care of the pit he could start by getting some holes in there so the fire truck can back in on those stumps if they needed to. Scott Grant asked how the board would like to proceed with this because he will call Sean back and tell him of the board's decision. David Shedd asked if Sean was invited to this Planning Board session? Scott Grant responded no but we could invite him next month or present him with an action plan and then go back and see what he has done. David Shedd responded that by July 1st Sean should be able to have those fire breaks and if he doesn't he had better come in with a fairly clear plan of what he intends to do. Scott Grant asked the board if they wanted one fire break, two fire breaks or more? He stated Sean alluded that he would not put any more stumps there and there was a long discussion regarding the water. Heather Forbes asked

if we could get it in writing? Pat Roberts asked what would Sean do with the material that he digs out? Scott Grant replied he can make a hole forward when the stumps come out and go to the side. He can make money off of this stuff and I think he will eventually but the main concern in this immediate time frame is fire. Is there anything else that you are worried about? I want to do one thing at a time because Sena will get overwhelmed. David Shedd added I would say at least 2 fire breaks of which David Patch added about 1/3 of the way from each end- also as wide as you need to get the back of a truck in there. Also, the stumps need to be pulled forward. Heather Forbes asked if it could be in writing otherwise there was no enforcement. Scott Grant replied he understood what Sean was doing -he is putting the stumps down the hole but we are dealing with the potential of fire and he is not putting more stumps in there. Vicki Garland added that Sean needs a deadline and then what consequences can we provide if he doesn't do what we are asking him to do? David Patch stated it is a gravel pit and we are in charge under RSA 153 however it is too vague for my liking. Vicki Garland asked if the board could shut him down? David Patch added there is a lot that you can do they basically said health welfare and the well-being of everybody. Scott Grant assured the board he would contact Sean the next day and inform him of what the board discussed and that he needed two fire cuts so the fire truck can back in there. Heather Forbes added she felt the board had handled this appropriately- you invited him to an initial meeting two months ago and you did not push too hard, you discussed bringing him in and being more aggressive but cooler heads prevailed- so this is not the first time he is hearing of this. He is not getting caught by surprise. He has had the opportunity to marinate on this and now you are giving him a lot more leverage and leeway by saying do you think you can make some forward momentum in a month or two months. I think

that this is completely reasonable. The way the board has approached this entire process has been very reasonable. Scott Grant asked the board if it was okay to get back to Sean Shannon and tell him what was discussed and giving him a deadline of July 1st to make progress. Board concurred with this plan.

- **Catherine Steesy (Tax Map 6WTS000344-000017)-** Cathy Steesy presented- she stated she is actually a buyer representative for two different parties. She resides at 73 West Side Woods Road and is speaking about house number 24 and lot 28 on the inside of the curve of West Side Woods subdivision. The property is going on the market soon. The Sawyers also own a vacant lot that abuts it. We are talking about lots 26 and 27 of which lot 27 is already developed. The people on the other side is Robert and Alison LaFond and they have a home that is also built at 38 West Side Woods Road. The buyer I have has an offer on 24 West Side Woods Road and would like to buy ½ of the vacant lot and the LaFond's want to but the other half. David Patch stated they have to do a boundary line adjustment to each side of the lot. Cathy Steesy stated yes that is what was sort of agreed on and what we wanted to know is do we have to get a surveyor to put pins in. We could use the existing pins and do a diagonal using the existing pins. David Shedd asked where the houses were on the plan presented by Cathy Steesy and she replied the plan supplied was the subdivision plan. David Shedd asked how does the board know if the lines that were drawn relate to the houses and the setbacks? Cathy Steesy replied the houses are all set back in their lots the way they are and supposed to be. This is just concerning the vacant lot and dividing the vacant lot. The board asked if she wanted to take three lots and make them two. Cathy Steesy replied yes. David Patch added on the diagonal that would keep the septic area or test pit in the correct spot. She asked if he meant lot 26 and added that was not consequential as it would be absorbed into the other two lots. Vicki Garland clarified it was test pit 26 not lot 26 as seen on the

plan. Cathy Steesy replied that no one cares as there is no plan in putting in another septic. Each house has a current septic and the houses are not getting bigger or expanding. They just want a buffer for privacy. Vicki Garland asked if the septic plans did not involve the centerline which Cathy Steesy replied correct. David Patch asked for clarification if the test pit in that area will never be used to which Cathy Steesy replied it will never be used. Heather Forbes added that this may be well and good for the current property owners but if they were to go and sell their new property with this new half a lot to new buyers would the new buyers come to the town and ask for some type of modification? The rules can't apply to those that are living there now it has to be for the future. Cathy Steesy added they are going to merge the half lot to the other one. David Patch answered Heather Forbes comment that in order to do that you would have to get Concord to agree to that and approve their septic system. They don't have enough of a set back too subdivide. David Shedd asked if the applicant representative is asking for a merger rather than a boundary line adjustment? Scott Grant replied that it is a boundary line adjustment for both parties. He added the owners are the ones that have to make the application. The person that owns two lots and the person that owns one lot and the vacant lot between them- a boundary line adjustment for the person that owns two lots says they are giving up half our land to the other owner and that person is getting more land and you will have to get a surveyor. David Patch added if you went on the diagonal he assumed the pins were already set. Cathy Steesy replied yes but it does not make the split 50/50. She asked if they went pin to pin would that just be a change in the deed description? David Patch answered yes. Scott Grant asked if the pins were there and marked? Cathy Steesy replied yes. Scott Grant added if you did the diagonal you would probably be okay. Cathy Steesy asked the procedure for the town for this project. Scott Grant replied that they would come to the Planning Board with

an application for a boundary line adjustment (supplied to Cathy Steesy) and the person that owns two lots would have to come and do that. The other person's information would have to be there too. Cathy Steesy asked if she could come as a representative for them? David Patch added if she had the deeds showing this person owns this and the other person owns that but if Cathy Steesy does not have a surveyor's license then the owners have to come. Scott Grant added the board will need a detailed map of the two lots with the description and links and all that stuff along with the roads needs to be on there also. Cathy Steesy expressed understanding. Secretary explained Mr. Whitman called the office and asked if the lot could be sold in the future? I explained that Bartlett had a minimal land area requirement for septic. David Patch added that in order for that to occur he would have to get both people (who now own the lot in the middle) to agree. David Shedd added there are road frontage requirements also and that would make a difference as to where you put the diagonal boundary. David Patch added that the board warns people that once this is done they probably cannot undo it. Board informed Cathy Steesy that the process can occur in one meeting but the application needs to be into the office 20 days before the next public meeting. If she wishes to be on the agenda for the July 6th meeting the application is due by June 16th. Cathy Steesy asked if the listing agent could be the representative. Scott Grant replied he was not an attorney, but he recommended/advised not doing that. If anything goes sour or south it is better for the owners to be here.

- **Review of Senate and House Bills-** Information provided via email. David Patch asked if the Selectmen have had any discussion regarding the bill that allows building on a class 6 road. Vicki Garland replied yes, just in terms of what we think we can do- we don't know. Board concurred there will be a test case regarding this bill and we will have to monitor the outcome.
- **Application spreadsheet-** ongoing project

- **Article from NHMA “Multiple Membership on Land Use Boards and Select Boards”- Brief discussion by the board and encouragement by chair to read the article. Article added for reference**



Article from NHMA
Multiple Membershi

5.Next meeting: Working Session June 16, 2026 if needed next public session July 6, 2026

Board discussed the need for a work session on June 16th and unanimously agreed there will not be a session on June 16th.

David Shedd asked if he could discuss the bond. Board agreed. Davis Shedd expressed his appreciation that Alec Tarberry did not have an opinion, but he added that Jim Wilson did not seem to care for it. One of the things that helps is about 10 years ago the Planning Board had purview over the road approval and a Selectmen did not like the idea and went to the legislature and had that authority taken away from us. He said that he felt they have not done a good job on the Block F Road. I don't see how a house is on lot F6 or whatever the lot is. If the Selectmen are agreeable, I would like to just look at two different bonds of two different amounts and then have the Selectmen take care of the financial part of it. He asked if he had the blessing of the board because he did not want to go again as an innocent bystander. Secretary clarified her understanding that the Selectmen would like the Planning Board be responsible for the amount of the bond for the water but the Selectmen are the responsible party for the fiscal part of the bond. David Patch concurred that the Selectmen have to be the responsible party for the fiscal component. Michael Galante stated he listened to what Jim Wilson said about both bonds being combined and having one lump sum and that as something is finished you check off that it was completed. To me it makes sense to have both bonds together. He asked David Shedd to explain why he felt different. David Shedd replied- I think it is up to us if we choose to reduce the bond. I think we are required by law to reduce the bond, and I don't like the idea of reducing the bond because it has been four years since the approval of Block F and the road is not half done. Michael Galante asked if the bond has been reduced? David Shedd answered yes they have, it went from like \$1.2 million to now it is \$400,000 based on Burr's recommendation. Michael Galante stated that this tells us we can finish the road for \$400,000. David Shedd added that is what Burr says. Vicki Garland added that four years have gone by and what with costs today. David Shedd added that the pumphouse never

showed up on the cost projection. Michael Galante stated with all that said would it not be best to have the funds combined financially? That way we can pick and choose and you can't say this is water. Scott Grant clarified that the board can only pick and choose this is water the Selectmen can do the roads. Secretary added it makes sense to combine the bonds because as Jim Wilson and Burr Phillips stated you can finish this part and not finish all of the other part if there is money left over you can shift the money over to provide a cushion. Pat Roberts asked if the water system costs \$7 million dollars is the bond based on that \$7 million dollars? Michael Galante explained it is a percentage of the value. Pat Roberts added but if the roads are \$3 million dollars are they trying to get a combined bond of \$10 million dollars? Scott Grant replied yes because as per Jim Wilson it is cheaper. Vicki Garland added what she heard was flexibility because if the roads cost more than we thought it would and the water costs less we still have money in the bond to cover it. Scott Grant added only if they do not finish the projects. Pat Roberts stated that is why I asked the question the way I did because if you don't put enough money in or figure the project high enough your bond isn't going to be enough to cover the project to begin with. Michael Galante stated if it's all together it is one project not to mention you can't get an occupancy permit without one thing being finished. Pat Roberts stated he was not opposed to it but we need to make sure they propose a bond to cover or underrate the project to make the bond cheaper. Michael Galante added the pumphouse never entered the equation so why can't we just go and say hey what about the pump house? Scott Grant answered that Block G would eliminate the pump house. David Shedd clarified that the pump house was in the original approval for Block F because Alec Tarberry didn't have enough pressure and now the water is coming downhill. That is assuming they are getting to Block G- if they don't get to Block G they have to do something. David Patch stated that these all good comments and we can have oversight of seeing what they are and are not doing and have all kinds of input if we want to. When all is said and done when it comes to reducing the water bond we have the right to say no but the Selectmen control the money and the risk of all that . It is nice to have oversight but we don't have any teeth. David Shedd asked if we could ask the Selectmen if we can have control of those things. David Patch explained they cannot give you teeth, their responsibility is the finances of the town and they cannot give that away, it is the law. Once we gave up the roads that was the only teeth we had. So now the bond is controlled by the Selectmen, whether it is reduced is controlled by the Selectmen because the Planning Board cannot borrow or spend money as it is a Selectmen function only. David Shedd asked if we could ask the Selectmen to ask our advice before they reduce the bond on the water side. David Patch added that is a very reasonable request and they can if they want to. However this discussion cannot really go anywhere because we don't have the right to have any teeth financially-we are not going to vote on it but we can have an opinion but for us to have control of the water bond is a paper tiger. David

Shedd added he did not mind going to the Selectmen on his own and if the board does not want him to represent them he is just trying to understand the process. David Patch added he did not mind asking the Selectmen if the Planning Board could have some oversight and some input when the bond is to be reduced and we will get input from the applicant regarding to how well the water is coming. We can ask all the questions we want, and we could ask the Selectmen to please consult us before they do any deep dives and lower the bond. I have no problem in asking as we have always cooperated well together. Vicki Garland added that Burr Phillips is also involved in these decisions.

Scott Grant asked the board to consider things like AI and data centers. There have been a few towns in New Hampshire that have banned data centers. It may be needed to be added to the Master Plan. Pat Roberts stated he did not want them in the state of New Hampshire. David Patch concurred but added that data centers are coming whether we want them to or not. Vicki Garland added it was not AI but the environmental destruction that data centers are causing in terms of use and it ends up costing everyone more around them more money. Pat Roberts added that they really don't sell anything, but they take in information. Michael Galante added that we could delay and say if you are going to build a data center you have to generate your own electricity. Vicki Garland asked how are they going to generate their own water? Michael Galante answered they have to put a well in. Pat Roberts objected, stating if they put a well in, they are just taking water from the rest of the town's people. Scott Grant clarified he understood they were self-contained. Michael Galante stated that the water is not wasted as they recycle the water. Secretary mentioned that in New Jersey there was a nuclear power plant that had the same system for cooling the center- water came in and cooled the system then was recirculated. However, the water changed and as a result the ecosystem changed. There would have to be a way for the water to be cooled again before it was recirculated. And that would cause more electricity use. Vicki Garland added that before she supported them in her community, she would like them to rectify the problems they have caused in every other community because that is all you hear. I Scott Grant asked the board if they would entertain having something on the ballot for the town to vote on data centers this March? He asked the board to think about it and have this for discussion at the next meeting.

Motion made by Heather Forbes seconded by Vicki Garland. Vote unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 7:44 PM



Board sign in
06-01-2026.pdf



Public sign in
06-01-2026.pdf

Respectfully Submitted

Louise B. Burns

Planning Board/ZBA Secretary

APPROVED