

**TOWN OF HOLDERNESS
PLANNING BOARD
Tuesday,
November 27, 2018 6:30PM**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: R. Snelling called the meeting to order at 6:30.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

Members Present: Robert Snelling, Chairman; Carl Lehner, Vice Chairman; Woodie Laverack, Ex-Officio; Ronald Huntoon, Member; Angi Francesco, Member

Members Not Present: Donna Bunnell, Secretary; Louis Pare, Member

Staff Present: Linda Levy, Land Use Board Assistant

Others Present: Will Davis, Tony LeMenager, Kristen Fuller, Bryan Biederman, Scott Biederman, WJ Doucette

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The draft of the October 16, 2018 minutes was reviewed. C. Lehner suggested edits to the minutes.

Motion: "To accept the minutes as amended."

Motion: C. Lehner

Second: R. Huntoon

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 5-yes 0-no 0-absent 2-absent

NEW APPLICATIONS: None

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS: None

OTHER BUSINESS:

- Discussion regarding the potential adoption of road standards (Kevin Coburn) was moved to the December 18th meeting.
- Discussion with Brian Biederman who is seeking advice regarding changes to his cabin at Perkins Cabins; he wants to add a 4' deck and change the roof to cover the deck (see drawings). The site plan dates back to 1995 and was never signed. See a letter to Ray Ross (dated 5/31/18).
- B. Biederman: Our objective tonight was to come here and propose extending the current porch on our cabin at Perkins Cabins. You have the drawings of what that would look like. In addition, we also wanted to bring up the site plan review, which the town had requested. That is being worked on now. John March is ¾ of the way done.
- R. Snelling: You do intend to use this as a porch and not close it in as an extra bedroom?
- B. Biederman: No, just as a porch.
- A. Francesco: As a screen porch?
- B. Biederman: The current porch that has windows is 5' and we want to add an additional 4' so that we can actually use that space. In addition to that, we want to add to the roof line to come out roughly 18". Another reason for that is the roof needs to be addressed.
- R. Snelling: We have 2 issues. If we had a site plan in our hands. I can't see any issues associated with putting on a porch.
- A. Francesco: That's why we need the site plan because we have no idea how close this cabin is to the water.

- B. Biederman: You do have a site plan, it is just not current.
 - R. Snelling: It was never approved. It doesn't have any signatures on it.
 - B. Biederman: I think the one you have from 1995 did have signatures, although that company has gone out of business.
 - S. Biederman: Here is one from 2008. There are no dimensional things on it to show distances.
 - R. Snelling: Distances are the issue.
 - B. Biederman: When we started digging into it, we weren't sure what the protocol was. That's why we're here – trying to figure out setbacks.
 - R. Snelling: There might be. It is all about distances from adjacent things. Just a quick look at it doesn't look there would be, but without a site plan, we can't tell.
 - S. Biederman: On that site plan, is that what you're looking for?
 - R. Snelling: On a site plan we look at a whole bunch of things. There is a list – parking, lighting, setbacks, all of those things. The driver is your porch. That site plan review requires a public hearing, which means we post it and your neighbors know that your property is being reviewed. The process is to submit a site plan, have a public hearing on it.
 - A. Francesco: I have 2 small concerns. Is there something in here that would be an Eleanor question? Does there need to be X number of feet between buildings for firetruck access? Is it in the deed or something that we have in the town record?
 - R. Snelling: That would be an appropriate thing to look at in the site plan.
 - A. Francesco: My other question is about lot coverage. I think that is going to be covered in the site plan.
 - WJ Doucette: I think we were told 50%. Currently, we're at 35%. I don't think adding the porch is going to change the percentage at all. The site plan will have all that.
 - R. Snelling: That would be your process. Bring in a site plan, we have a public hearing, discuss these kinds of issues and then, you can get your building permit.
 - B. Biederman: We want to make sure that we're doing everything in the right order.
 - R. Snelling: Assuming we don't discover something like distance between cabins, you just need a building permit.
 - S. Biederman: Would that document need to get to you before that meeting for review?
 - R. Snelling: You bring it to the meeting.
 - L. Levy: You bring it to me in order to get it on the next agenda.
 - B. Biederman: The public review is at another scheduled meeting like this?
 - R. Snelling: Yes
 - A. Francesco: Linda has the schedule of deadlines.
-
- Conceptual review discussion with Will Davis regarding a proposed academic building and associated driveway and parking at Holderness School.
-
- T. LaMenager: I'll give you a narrative about what this plan is all about. The plan is to build a new academic building that will contain science classes, labs and math. It conceptually will be 30-32,000' as a preliminary design. It will be a 2-story building on the west side, entering from Chapel Lane. On the back side of campus there is a pretty significant bank, it will be on that westside. As part of the project we will create a ring road through campus for through traffic flow on a daily basis and from Eleanor's perspective on an emergency basis. We have preliminary or final approval for that driveway from the state. I'm not quite sure where we are, but we seem to be trending in that direction. That road would come behind all of our buildings with the goal to eliminate some of the parking on campus to keep vehicle pedestrian interaction to a minimum. We'll recapture current campus parking on other parts of the campus. It will involve sewer and water.
 - R. Snelling: Is this in response to increased enrollment?

- T. LaMenager: No, the school has revisited those numbers and concluded that we are the right size for our niche. This is in response to identity needs. We have a really limited science facility at the moment. We want to be competitive, but not increase numbers at the school.
- R. Snelling: When you've made all these decisions, we'd want to see an updated site plan.
- T. LaMenager: We just wanted to make sure that you were in the loop. We are trying to get in the ground in the late spring or early summer and finish in mid-November 2020. We have some other decisions to make. The road work would get going sooner.
- W. Laverack: Would it require a lot of fill as you are right on the edge?
- W. Davis: We are currently in design about that. The road would go behind the building, the first floor would be on grade, the basement would go out to the road.
- R. Huntoon: You must have done some study on the storm water management – what will happen to all of your run-off?
- W. Davis: This project is going to require an authorization permit with the state for storm water. We've started doing some investigation about how we would manage that. We're trying to sort through that. When we come back, we'll have a better handle on that.
- R. Snelling: That would be the one issue that pops into my mind.
- W. Davis: We're considering metal moorings.
- A. Francesco: A lot of that would not be permeable as long as you're adding a road.
- R. Huntoon: It is a sand bank. You'd have to make sure it not going to wash away.
- W. Davis: We're still back and forth on exactly how we're going to secure that slope.
- R. Snelling: Are there any other issues the board needs to be aware of.
- W. Laverack: So, that eastern elevation is really going to be one story up and the second story is below with a walk-out?
- T. LaMenager: You'll see 2 stories from the east and a walk-out. The basement is mechanical. It is going to be a big building, we want to make sure it is complementary to campus.
- W. Davis: We are shooting for a Dec. 19th submission.
- T. LaMenager: Should we anticipate needing a meeting beyond that depending on how the meeting in January goes?
- R. Snelling: Unless there are some unanswerable questions that come up, like storm water. We have to be comfortable with the design. Assuming issues like that are addressed in a reasonable way, I don't see why we'd have to go beyond the public hearing and the site plan review.
- A. Francesco: You might have to approach the state for engineering.
- W. Davis: We probably will have submitted it to the state by then. The plans that we submit to you will be the same plans that we submit to the state, that's the goal. We'll have the full permitting plans together and will include our drainage narrative and all the calculations. They are taking 50-60 days to get back to us, so by the Jan. meeting, I probably won't have all the permitting in hand, but it will have been submitted to them by that point.
- R. Snelling: We could approve conditionally.
- W. Davis: We would expect that. The other permit would be with Plymouth village for the sewer connection.
- T. LaMenager: The state also for the water. We have a privately-owned redistribution system which means that we're taking Plymouth village's water and distributing it through campus. When we want to make changes on campus of any real size, we have to go to the state with that. They want to know the pipe material, depth of bury.
- R. Snelling: We'd want to know what kind of labs you're going to have in there and what kind of discharges, both air and water. Whose property do you tie into for the septic and water system?
- T. LaMenager: The sewer comes from the south side of campus to the path behind the chapel, underneath I93, and ends up at PSU sub-station.
- R. Snelling: There is no change to your property for sewage and septic. We'd also like to see what kind of filtration you have in the labs.
- T. LaMenager: What is unknown right now is the kind of boilers. It will probably be propane.

- R. Huntoon: That central plant is big enough to add that building to it?
 - T. LaMenager: We're crunching the numbers. We built extra capacity anticipating new buildings. The pipes are not the right size so, we have the capacity, but we may have to trench 600' to change the size of the pipes or have stand alone boilers. That is getting decided over the next month or two.
 - R. Snelling: Technically, this project would come under the umbrella of a project of regional impact in that it impacts two towns. The impact on Plymouth would be your septic system. So, we'd want to see something from Plymouth also feeling comfortable with what is going through there.
 - T. LaMenager: We're talking with Plymouth and with PSU.
 - W. Davis: If you think this is going to be a project of regional impact, is that something you could notify the planning boards of now or do you need to wait.
 - R. Snelling: The only thing that is really required is who you are potentially impacting is given an opportunity to comment. We don't have to accept their comments. But I think as a neighbor we want to make sure that they are comfortable with what is going through their treatment plants.
 - A. Francesco: That falls more under the conditional approval though and not necessarily a regional impact.
 - R. Snelling: Where you get in trouble is not raising the fact that it will have some impact, as small as it is. If we don't raise the issue, the court could overrule the board. It is a process thing.
 - W. Davis: The only issue it presents is giving them time to respond.
 - R. Huntoon: When you apply to hook into their system, they will ask lots of questions.
 - T. LaMenager: They are asking questions.
 - R. Snelling: We'd be negligent if we didn't make sure that they feel comfortable as well.
-
- R. Snelling: There is a home Yoga business in a home that runs between Ashland and Holderness. The Ashland Planning Board turned it down due to parking concerns. We agreed on the same grounds. She went ahead and did parking lot development. She is appealing that decision. There was no other problem beyond the parking. There is a hearing on that Wednesday, 11/28. R. Snelling will attend.
 - R. Snelling: On Dec. 11, from 2-4pm, we are hosting a FEMA information gathering related to our flood zone. Flood zone is one of the major issues in rewriting the ordinance. It is very confusing. If you can attend, it will be worthwhile. Snow day on Dec. 18.
 - Master plan.
-
- A. Francesco: I'm still waiting to see the proposals from the Conservation folks.
 - R. Snelling: I was told you have that.
 - A. Francesco: Michael said he was going to send it to me and I have not seen it yet.
 - R. Snelling: We collectively have their comments.
 - A. Francesco: If this group has the Conservation Commission's comments then, this group needs to make recommendations.
 - R. Snelling: Right, I think your committee should take the first crack at their recommendations. You may not agree with them. A lot of them are language things. You guys wrote it, they reviewed it. I think you ought to take a run at it and then bring back.
 - A. Francesco: I just talked with them and they felt strongly that the Planning Board should come up with the recommendations.
 - R. Snelling: There is a lot more in their comments than recommendations.
 - A. Francesco: If you look at the definitions in the chapter before, there is a whole section of recommendations moving forward and things to do in the future and the master plan committee felt that the Planning Board needs to be the group that at least crafted the ideas behind that as to what it was going to be.
 - R. Snelling: Ok, we can do that, but I would rather do that after you have responded to their comments. Their comments go beyond their recommendations.

- Discussion on proposed zoning ordinance changes
- R. Snelling: Zoning change recommendations are being driven by Christine Fillmore, the town's Council. The committee of 3 has been meeting and came up with these suggestions. If we have a consensus, we will have a public hearing in December and then have them in time to present to the town at the March meeting. These are about 20% of the ordinances that need to be addressed. Others will be brought before the board as the sub-committee reviews them.
- Proposal A: Eliminate the Waukewan Watershed District. We have no standards for this district. We need to have documentation of which watersheds Holderness impacts. That should be in the master plan maps.
- A. Francesco: I believe they are in the new maps.
- R. Huntoon: Shouldn't the people who monitor those watersheds be in a better position to decide what kind of ordinances they needed protection than us? They would recommend to us what they would like to see happen or not happen.
- R. Snelling: My understanding is they would hope that we would expand the minimum lot size in that area, but they never officially asked us to do that and we never did it.
- Is there consensus? Yes
- Proposal B: Add "Section 900" to Introductory paragraph related to Special Exceptions.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal C: Change the wording to explicitly list the waterbodies in Shoreland Frontage to include the shore of Squam Lake, White Oak Pond and the Pemigewasset River.
- This eliminates confusion related to streams, etc.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal D: Change "the boundary" to "a boundary" in the CD and RCO Districts, and the District Boundary Dispute Ordinance.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal E: Add "Accessory Farming and Agriculture Activities" to Special Exceptions
- This is driven by agritourism (activities that are accessory to farming and agriculture).
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal F: Add a new general provision for General Farming and Agriculture.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal G: Delete "Space" in Lot Coverage.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal H: Delete "open space" in Permitted Uses.

- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal I: Add wording to Fire Damaged and Hazardous Building.
- According to Council we have the right to regulate aesthetics. We can't eliminate judgement.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal J: Change and add wording to Street Frontage in GR District.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal K: Change and add wording to Street Frontage in RR District.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal L: Change and add wording to Street Frontage in CD District.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal M: Eliminate the ordinance Frontage – Multiple Dwelling Units
- The wording was added to Street Frontage in the RR District to make it more consistent with the other Street Frontage ordinances in the other districts.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal N: Add ordinances to reference Lot Area to GR, RR, CD and FH Districts.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal O: Change "space" to "areas" and Playgrounds" to "recreation in Subdivision Regulations.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal P: Change the wording in definitions to Easement, Right-of-Way, and Lot.
- There is a state standard for easements and right of ways. They are legally the same.
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Proposal Q: Add Accessory Farming and Agricultural Activities, Farm Roadside Stands, and General Farming and Agriculture as new Definitions
- Is there consensus? Yes?
- Next Meeting - Tuesday, December 18, 2018 at 6:30PM

CORRESPONDENCE: None

ADJOURNMENT: At 7:55 the following motion was made:

Motion "To adjourn."

Motion: A. Francesco

Second: W. Laverack

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 5-yes 0-no