



49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98

J. McLane asked if Unitil had a specific timeline to complete the work. G. Greenwood interjected that though towns can apply conditions such as specific timelines, the scenic roads law was established to create a streamlined process for utility companies to complete necessary work, as the previous process could be long and cumbersome.

The Chairperson opened to hearing to public comment.

Hans Rutishauser of 51 Moulton Ridge Rd. asked if the when the Planning Board approved the conditional use permit for the cell tower, were they aware that there would need to be extensive maintenance and upgrades to trees, poles, and wires along Moulton Ridge Rd, and if they had known about it, would it have impacted their decision. J. McLane and M. Smith responded by highlighting the 50-60 year old again electrical infrastructure on the road that is already in need of maintenance.

A resident at 51 Moulton Ridge Rd. expressed concerns with what she feels is a very significant number of trees being cut.

Anne Smith of 63 Moulton Ridge Rd. expressed concerns about an ash tree on her property that she feels should be tagged but hasn't been.

Denise Bernier of 29 Moulton Ridge Rd. expressed concern over her perception that the town cannot say "no" to utility companies on these issues. She discussed her issues with feeling compelled to consent to the work, as well as what she described as the utility company leaving a mess behind them once work was complete.

Linda Bennet of 62 Moulton Ridge Rd. expressed concerns about the potential loss of the tree canopy.

Linda Gunn of 43 Moulton Ridge asked if the work would lead to wear and tear on the road and increased traffic. J. McLane stated that while that issue was discussed during the hearings held for the cell tower approval, it was not germane to the proposal in front of them from Unitil.

Peter Sawyer of 53 Moulton ridge Rd if there was a difference between the length of the ribbons used to mark the trees, asked how Unitil will address emergency situations such as public safety response. Mr. Sawyer also expressed concern about what he felt was the ambiguity of the proposal.

The Chairperson closed public comment and invited the applicant to address questions from the public.

Mr. Richards explained that the length and color of ribbons used to mark trees for maintenance does not indicate the level of maintenance for a tree. He further explained that the proposal was only to conduct maintenance on trees that are in the town's right of way, and that homeowners must give their consent for Unitil to conduct any tree maintenance. Mr. Richards explained that if a homeowner does not consent to tree removal, a record is kept and if that tree does damage lines, once the lines are fixed, the felled tree will be left for the homeowner to address.

99 M. Smith asked the applicant to clarify if this maintenance is only for the cell tower, or,  
100 aside from pole and line maintenance, is the tree maintenance simply being moved up in  
101 schedule. Mr. Richards responded that the maintenance on the trees would eventually be  
102 done in the same way. He also explained that the poles that will be upgraded if cell tower  
103 commences in the future are the standard poles that are installed everywhere.  
104

105 G. Greenwood asked the applicant how many poles would be installed, and how many feet  
106 apart the poles would be. Mr. Richards explained that there would be 41 poles  
107 approximately 150' +/- apart.  
108

109 M. Smith asked how long the work would take. Mr. Richards responded that the work  
110 would take about 3 months in total.  
111

112 The board commenced deliberation on the application. J. McLane stated that since the  
113 Planning Board approved the cell tower application, Unutil has the right to perform  
114 maintenance on trees and infrastructure. M. Smith asked what would happen if the board  
115 denied the application. G. Greenwood stated that they would most likely end up in court  
116 with the utility company. He further clarified that the state scenic roads law allows the town  
117 to apply additional conditions to the utility company performing work and maintenance. J.  
118 McLane highlighted that the RSA is in place to provide a forum for the town and residents  
119 to discuss the proposal with the applicant and provide questions and concerns. He stated  
120 that if the scenic roads law wasn't in place, Unutil would most likely already be cutting.  
121

122 **MOTION: M. Smith motioned to approve the request for Unutil to conduct**  
123 **maintenance from 1-75 Moulton Ridge Rd. with the following condition:**  
124

125 **1. That Unutil conduct the maintenance in such a way that residents of Moulton Ridge**  
126 **Rd will have full access to their property, and that Unutil will work closely with**  
127 **residents and public safety departments in Kensington to ensure that work is safe and**  
128 **on schedule.**  
129

130 **M. Silvia seconded. All in favor.**  
131  
132

133 The Chairperson closed the public hearing.

134 **UPDATES ON PRIOR BUSINESS:**  
135

136 • **Budget for Master Plan Survey Mailings**  
137

138 B. Solomon said that the Selectboard is willing to spend money to do the survey correctly.  
139

140 • **Site Plan Review**  
141

142 *Tabled until the May 8, 2024 workshop to allow absent board members to participate in the*  
143 *discussion and approval.*  
144

145 • **New Planning Board Member Discussion**  
146

147 The board agreed to work on a process of appointment in order to make things fair and equitable,  
148 and to request that the applicants for Board membership attend two Planning Board meetings

149 before a candidate is selected for appointment. J. McLane suggested that the Land Use  
150 Administrative assistant coordinated with the applicants to hold discussions with the board chair.

151  
152

153 **Approval of Minutes from March 20, 2024.**

154

155 **MOTION: M. Smith motioned to approved the March 20, 2024 meeting minutes as amended. M.**  
156 **Silvia seconded. All in favor.**

157

158 **Any other business brought before the Planning Board**

159

160 Donna Carter of 119 Amesbury Rd. was in attendance to inquire if 98-100 Amesbury Rd. could be  
161 converted to 4 residential units from its current commercial use in the R/A district. The board discussed  
162 the issue. J. McLane stated that he feels that this is a zoning issue, and that gathering information from  
163 town files would be helpful in order to be able to provide guidance to Ms. Carter, and advice from legal  
164 counsel could be prudent if not enough information is available.

165

166 **Next Regular Monthly Meeting: Wednesday, May 15, 2024, at 6:30pm**

167

168 **Adjournment**

169

170 **MOTION: M. Smith motioned to adjourn the meeting. M. Silvia seconded. All in favor.**

171

172

173

174 Respectfully Submitted,

175

176 Owen Corcoran

177 Land Use Administrative Assistant