

TOWN OF HOLDERNESS
Planning Board Meeting Minutes: August 15, 2023

Angi Francesco, Chair called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

Members Present: Angi Francesco, Chair, Bill Nesheim, Vice Chair, Carl Lehner, Member, Janet Cocchiaro, Member, Ron Huntoon, Member, Clayton Titus, Member, Peter Francesco, Ex-Officio

Members Absent: Christine Renzi, Alternate

Also Present: Lucinda Hannus, Land Use Assistant, Amy Sanders, Fuss and O'Neill, Hannah Trull and Robert Fougere, Airelle Properties, additional attendees as indicated on sign in sheet.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 18, 2023

Angi Francesco asked for any corrections to the minutes. Correct spelling of Shepard Hill Road

MOTION: "To approve the minutes of July 18, 2023 as corrected"

Motion: R. Huntoon

Second: B. Nesheim

Discussion: None

Motion Passed: 7–Yes 0– No

PUBLIC HEARINGS: Continuation of Case # 2023-06-06 Site Plan Review submitted by Fuss & O'Neil as agent for Airelle Properties, LLC owner of the Manor on Golden Pond, 9 Serenity Lane, Map 102 Lot 033 to add a 2-story function facility w/ basement, add a greenhouse, convert the carriage house to a spa and fitness center, expand the parking area, and add walking paths and a patio in the Commercial District (CD).

Chair A. Francesco re-opened the case and inquired as to any changes made to the plans since last month's meeting?

Amy Sanders, Senior Project Engineer for Fuss & O'Neill replied that there were not and that they were waiting on a decision with regards to the location of the new parking lot and detention pond.

B. Nesheim stated that he had walked the property along with Mr. Jenkinson's property across the street. He stated that he felt that the proposed parking lot was too close to the property line, and that he would like to see Serenity Lane moved to the north to allow for parking to be relocated to reduce encroachment on the neighborhood across the street.

A. Sanders replied that she believes there is an existing septic system in that area precluding them from using that area for parking or a roadway.

B. Nesheim continued by stating that parking being required to be outside of building setbacks may not be specifically addressed in the zoning ordinance but this commercial use and the removal of trees is a significant impact to the abutting residential properties. Mr. Nesheim thanked the applicant for the detailed drainage plan and stated he felt it would be an improvement to the existing conditions and was not as concerned with that being in the setback. Parking within the setback was however a significant concern in his mind.

J. Cocchiaro stated she had the same concerns, there was an event there over the past weekend for about 150 people and there were parked vehicles all along the interior roadways.

A. Sanders replied that the proposed fence and landscaping treatment had not been acceptable to the abutting property owners.

B. Nesheim stated it would be a shame to take down the mature white pines along that area.

A. Francesco added that the requirement to meet the 35' setback may not be specific in the ordinance but has consistently in most recent applications been adhered to. It would be a good gesture on the part of the applicant to relocate approximately six parking spaces outside of the setback and provide a vegetated deciduous buffer along Shepard Hill Road.

B. Nesheim stated that a berm and the existing stonewall may be high enough to shield automobile headlights protecting the residential abutters.

A. Sanders stated that they were concerned with creating additional impervious surfaces and they could possibly add additional spaces adjacent to the garage area.

A. Francesco inquired as to questions from the audience.

A Shepard Hill Road resident stated that since there was no direct entrance or exit from the parking area to Shepard Hill Road, she did not have any issues with the plan as presented.

B. Nesheim asked if the Chief of Police had any comments on the traffic study. NHDOT produces a report of annual traffic counts and the peak was between 10am and 5 pm and adding 60 or so more vehicles could be problematic.

L. Hannus replied that she had not received any comments to date.

J. Jenkinson stated that the nature of the proposed facility is different than what is currently on the property. He is more concerned with the noise factor of vehicles coming and going especially at night. The last event had a school bus for attendees which took 10 -15 minutes around midnight with it's back up alarm sounding that was very disturbing. He feels this is a major change and will have impacts both to the neighborhood and the town.

Alternate Christine Renzi joined the meeting.

A. Sanders stated that the owners were willing to limit hours of operation to close at 10pm.

Hearing no other comments from the audience, Chair A. Francesco closed the discussion.

A. Sanders consulted privately with the owners and returned to publicly state that they would relocate approximately four (4) parking spaces from the setback and move them to the area of the garage as requested.

C. Titus would like to see them retain as much of the existing vegetation and trees as possible.

C. Renzi stated she felt it was a benefit to the applicant to preserve the vegetation.

B. Nesheim made the following motion:

“Motion to conditionally approve the site plan as presented by the applicant pending receipt of all necessary state and town permits, encourage the preservation and maintenance of the existing natural barriers, and relocate approximately four (4) parking spaces from the setback to an area outside of the setback.”

Second: J. Cocchiaro

Motion passed 6 – Yes 0 – No 1- Abstention

NEW BUSINESS: None

OLD BUSINESS: Fireworks Ordinance

A. Francesco opened the discussion by reintroducing the DRAFT fireworks ordinance to the members as a jumping off document to bring up ideas for discussion.

R. Huntoon inquired if an owner knows what is going on on their property, then they take on the responsibility and potential consequences of allowing a renter to set off fireworks.

C. Renzi asked do they really mean to restrict fireworks to areas farther than 250’ from a waterbody?

A. Francesco stated that the heavy metals falling into the lake are a major concern to her. Part of the goal is to restrict them to large open fields and that most properties have a vegetated buffer along their shorelines to protect water quality.

P. Francesco stated that the White Oaks Pond proposal that was presented at town meeting can not be restricted to only one area of town but must apply uniformly across all of the town.

K. Barrett stated that he respects the patriotic aspect of fireworks, likes restricting them to certain times of the year and before 10 pm, that the safest place to display them is over the lake and would like to see a balance of do’s and don’ts.

A. Francesco stated the ordinance has date restrictions.

An audience member stated that fireworks pollute horribly, they are terrifying to wildlife and domestic animals, and upset people with PTSD issues. She would like to see a defined period where they are allowed and curtail the randomness that is currently occurring.

A. Francesco would like to see the notice of a permit posted to the town’s website.

R. Huntoon stated that notifying abutters directly is problematic, feels that wildlife and domestic animals react differently and would like confirmation from an expert, such as someone from the science center to address that concern.

A. Francesco stated that the goal is to get a handle on how often, where and what is actually happening and make the permit something similar to the current special event permit process with a minimal fee.

B. Nesheim stated that people are spending huge amounts of money on firework displays, for big events that can go on for long times, but does not feel a need to be concerned with the person who shoots off a couple of roman candles. How do we get at that issue if there is no distinction within state law as to the type of fireworks people can display.

A. Francesco stated that the members should continue reviewing the DRAFT ordinance and the discussion would be continued at the next meeting.

A resident inquired as to the ability of a person to store commercial vehicles like tractor trailer trucks or septic pump trucks on a residential property when not on the road working.

L. Hannus advised the board that she was working tabulating the allowable uses and descriptions/definitions within zoning districts to see more clearly what is and is not allowed in each zone. That she would be supplying a spreadsheet for the members to review and asked that they think about uses, questions or other items that should be added or changed in the zoning ordinance for a future meeting in preparation for next year's town meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 6:40 PM, the following motion was made.

MOTION: "To adjourn."

Motion: J. Cocchiaro

Second: R. Huntoon

Discussion: None

Motion Passed: 7–Yes 0– No

NEXT MEETING: August 15, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

Lucinda Hannus
Land Use Assistant