

**TOWN OF HOLDERNESS
PLANNING BOARD
Tuesday, September 25, 2018 6:30PM**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: C. Lehner called the meeting to order at 6:30PM.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

Members Present: Carl Lehner, Vice Chairman; John Laverack, Ex-Officio; Donna Bunnell, Secretary; Ronald Huntoon, Member

Members Not Present: Robert Snelling, Chairman; Angi Francesco, Member; Louis Pare, Member

Staff Present: Linda Levy, Land Use Board Assistant

Others Present: Eleanor Mardin, Compliance Officer; April Vachon, Gardner Hall, Will Crawford, Rob Epp

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The draft of the August 21, 2018 was reviewed. D. Bunnell suggested typo edits to the minutes.

Motion: "To accept the minutes as amended."

Motion: R. Huntoon

Second: D. Bunnell

Discussion: None

Motion Passes 4-yes 0-no 3 absent

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Case # 18-08-07: Application submitted by John March as Agent for April Vachon who owns property at 73 East Holderness Rd., identified as tax map 252-013-000, to subdivide the property into two lots (Lot 1 will be a vacant 3.20 acre lot, Lot 2 will be 4.12 acres and has an existing house) located in the Rural Residential District, in accordance with the Town of Holderness Subdivision Regulations.

Application Discussion:

- G. Hall presented this case for A. Vachon. He shared that the survey was completed by John Marsh.
- D. Bunnell: Is the site of the drilled well within the 35' boundary?
- G. Hall: No, it is not within the set back.

Motion: "To accept the application for consideration by the Board."

Motion: R. Huntoon

Second: J. Laverack

Discussion: None

Motion Passes 5-yes 0-no 3 absent

Proposal Discussion:

- C. Lehner: Is the proposed driveway close to the property line?
- L. Levy: Kevin Coburn has seen the driveway application and has signed off on it.
- R. Huntoon: If a building was built on the property, where would it go?
- G. Hall: Toward the back of the property.
- R. Huntoon: Because the site of the drilled well is not within the set back, how will this affect the neighbor across the street? Should you have a letter from him supporting this proposal? You should get an agreement. It won't hold up anything you want to do.

- A. Vachon: The other property is on the other side of East Holderness Rd. His set back begins at the edge of the road.
- R. Huntoon: The site of the well could infringe on that property.
- D. Bunnell: Explained to A. Vachon that the well set back crosses the road.
- G. Hall: That's a good observation and I'll talk to Mike and Andy about it.
- R. Huntoon: You might want to get an easement or something like that. That will take care of problems that could arise if someone else moves in. They should be aware of it.
- D. Bunnell: The person buying this lot needs to know what they can do.
- G. Hall: The well could be placed in another place.
- R. Huntoon: That's a discloser thing.

Motion: "To approve the proposal for construction and renovation."

Motion: D. Bunnell

Second: R. Huntoon

Discussion: None

Motion Passes 5-yes 0-no 3 absent

(L. Levy reminded A. Vachon and G. Hall that they will need to submit the Mylar Plat and NHDES approval for the subdivision.)

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS: None

OTHER BUSINESS:

Conceptual Design discussion with Rob Epp (227-025)

- Change 6 unit building to 7 (6 unit application was approved 1/19/17; septic and parking are currently approved for 6 units)

Discussion:

- R. Epp purchased Holderness Farm 2 years ago. We are here to address the homestead (Farmhouse) building to present a conceptual design of the property going forward. This afternoon we put in an application for adding a 7th unit to the farmhouse. The concern was that we didn't have enough parking for that 7th unit, we would need 14 spaces. We actually do have 14 spaces. It is drawn out on the application. There was also concern about the septic. The current system is rated at 3000 gpd. We are using far less than that. The letter that was provided from the septic designer is to certify that it has far more capacity than would be used for 6 or 7 units. The septic should be fine.
- R. Huntoon: I've read this letter a couple of times and can't seem to get it. Can you simplify it for me?
- R. Epp: The last paragraph says everything that you're looking for, it states that the capacity is significantly higher than is needed. If someone from the state was to look at this, they could certify that the system was sufficient.
- R. Epp: The position of the original tanks had to change slightly because of the way the project was done from the original plan. It is not something that you would even notice from the 1st plan to the 2nd plan.
- C. Lehner: By rotating, he means he rotated the orientation?
- C. Lehner: By rotating, he means he rotated the orientation?
- W. Crawford: When the house was built, the out pipe was put in the wrong place on the plan. So the tanks had to move 15' towards the office. I requested a 2nd plan from the state. The plan that you have is the original that was redesigned for that purpose. I've requested an update from Brenda. As soon as we get that, I'll send it to you.

- C. Lehner: The last sentence says, "it was sole because it was shifted during installation". I'm not sure what was intended.
- W. Crawford: I can get clarification if you want.
- D. Bunnell: The shifting of the tanks shouldn't mean anything. They're set up to legally hold another unit.
- R. Epp: The septic system has 2 pumps. The system is designed for 3000 gpd, we only need 2100 gpd (300 gpd/unit). It was built way above what is actually needed. We want to recertify the system so we will know how much it can handle for the future, so we don't have to go back for more approvals. You will have the full capacity rating on file.
- D. Bunnell: You would only be allowed to have 8 total units in the building.
- R. Epp: That's the maximum for any contiguous building per code.
- D. Bunnell: Yes.
- R. Huntoon: You've done a lot of work.
- W. Crawford: We've tried to keep the farmhouse as it was, as much as possible.
- D. Bunnell: There is no problem with them adding a 7th unit.
- E. Mardin: Is this upstairs/downstairs or side-by-side?
- R. Epp: Upstairs/downstairs.
- W. Crawford: It was originally designed for 1 unit to have 2 floors, now it will be 2 separate units. Everything is hard wired to code.
- E. Mardin: There are 2 bedrooms, 1 upstairs and 1 downstairs, right?
- R. Epp: Correct.
- E. Mardin: You're not really adding anything to the septic because it was already a 2 bedroom apartment.
- R. Epp: Correct.
- C. Lehner: So, there are no more concerns about the 1st bullet point?
- D. Bunnell: No. So, it will be next month when we vote on it.
- L. Levy: In talking with B. Snelling, he suggested that as soon as we got approval from the state, they would be good to go.
- D. Bunnell: So, we don't have to vote on it next month?
- L. Levy: There was just a question on the septic capacity.
- D. Bunnell: You may continue with your plans.
- Holderness Farm Barn (plans for existing barn)

Discussion:

- R. Epp: There's been a lot of talk about the property, so we wanted to come before you to share our vision for what the property could become. We want to start a dialogue to see what the issues could be and to see where we navigate from here. We really want some feedback. I have a presentation, but I am going to give you some background first. I had a vision for a town event happening at the farm, it has great spaces. We've gotten advice from others. One thought is to put 50 retirement homes on the property.
- (W. Crawford handed out their master plan)
- R. Epp: The most important thing is to save the barn. The barn is in bad shape and we'd like to talk with you about how to do that. We think about this property in 4 phases. Phase 1 is the renovated farmhouse and the cow barn. The 2nd phase is addressing some of the other structures, the barn and the tractor shed. We'd like to come back next month to talk about phases 3 and 4, but give you some ideas about it tonight. We'd like to add another structure, a barn-like building for apartments in the center of the property. We'd like to do senior housing in the upper section of the property. There seems to be interest in that. We'd like to consider doing a farm stand in the tractor shed. We'd like to add fruit trees to help the farm exist again. We've already added hostas and blueberry bushes. We'd like to do garden

spaces for residents. The historic barn is big and can really hold a lot. Lots of people have stopped to talk about the property and feel connected to especially the barn. Page 1 of the proposal shows where we started and where we are today. The next page is the cow barn – it doesn't look much different on the outside but is different on the inside. It is used as a warehouse. People thought it was for chickens, but was an interior pasture for cows, then became an equipment shed. Phase 2 is the tractor shed with lots of potential.

- W. Crawford: We envision a farm stand for the tractor shed to make the property back into a farm. We could bring community back to the farm. We could be a coop for local farms.
- C. Lehner: Just out of curiosity, the farm stand, I think the left hand side is canted.
- W. Crawford: We've put the lumbar to fix it inside because we know we need to get your approval because it is going to cost more than \$5000 to fix it.
- R. Huntoon: When thinking about the barn and using it for large events, we'll probably need to see something that says it will hold all those people.
- W. Crawford: What we're trying to do is give you a step by step about what we'd like to do. We want to play by the rules, talk with Eleanor, and work with you to see how this could come about.
- C. Lehner: I don't know if we can legally advise you.
- W. Crawford: You can give us your insight or Eleanor can come over before we do all of this work. We don't want to spend money before we know if we can do all of this work. We want to make sure we play by the rules.
- E. Mardin: Is the property Rural Residential or General?
- R. Epp: General Residential
- C. Lehner: I like the concept overall.
- E. Mardin: If there is no change in the size of the dimensions of the tractor shed, I can approve that. What they plan to use it for is more of a zoning board issue, correct? If you run a business out of your property, you have to live on that property and you have to limit the number of people you employ. The farm stand will be 3 seasons (May to October). The issue is do we allow them to have another home business.
- C. Lehner: I believe we've gone a bit too far. We need a site plan review for the entire project.
- R. Epp: That's exactly the kind of things we're looking for.
- W. Crawford: The theme for tonight is really to save the barn.
- D. Bunnell: You're allowed to have a small business or 2200 sq.ft. You can have a small business there. And the barn can have a recreational facility of low impact.
- E. Mardin: It won't be the first in town to do that. Burleigh Farm and others do that. The biggest thing with the barn is the lower section (pole barn) which will mean two different entities (storage and a place of assembly). There are different things that you have to have for fire separation. It will be a lot of work between Rob and I to make sure it meets all of the codes. And, if you are planning on building on the part of the property that is not in current use, you need to know how much of that property can be built.
- R. Epp: I think it is 10,000 sq.ft. of open space. We have a surveyor for exactly that reason. We may separate the property into separate parcels as part of this whole plan.
- D. Bunnell: The other building can have not more than 8 units.
- E. Mardin: You may end up needing a separate septic.
- D. Bunnell: You're not talking about separate houses, are you?
- R. Epp: We are talking about separate houses actually in phase 4.
- E. Mardin: A site plan needs to be done. There is probably plenty of parking. The worst part is the traffic increase.
- D. Bunnell: I'm thinking about fire codes and septic. They are the 2 big things.
- R. Epp: In talking about the barn, the barn will take a while to work on. It is in bad shape. (He described the issue with rain run-off water.) We did emergency repairs so it wouldn't collapse and to shed the water away from the building.
- W. Crawford: We spent just under \$5000 to water mitigation in the back.

- R. Epp: One of the problems is the backside. It never got any cladding, it is a totally different looking structure. The ridgeline is straight, but the basement and roof have water problems. The cost is \$100,000-150,000 worth of repairs. We done \$8-10,000 right now. We're thinking of doing a gradual replacement. But to be functional, it needs repairs. It needs to pay for itself. We're thinking of ways that the barn can function to pay for itself.
- W. Crawford: If we turned the barn back into a working barn, it might pay for itself. We could have movie nights, old car nights, barn dance, Halloween Howl, family birthday parties, barn tours, weddings, funerals, family gatherings. We don't want to modernize it. We want to make sure it is fire safe. We want to have a collaboration with the community.
- R. Huntoon: Do you have a plan to get the town on board or interested in it?
- W. Crawford: As a secret, we want to call it "Talk of the Town". We want to make that barn part of the community.
- R. Epp: All of the tenets know about this.
- R. Huntoon: You're right, our community is spread out. You got me excited.
- D. Bunnell: I was extremely excited when I was on site. It our job to help them get where they want to be.
- W. Crawford: The women in the town hall said to present it.
- R. Huntoon: That makes sense so you know the rules that we have.
- C. Lehner: This will be beneficial to Holderness. I don't see any inherent reason why it could not happen. What we will need is a site plan review of the project that I suspect will change over time, but produce it the way you have it at the current time. It can change as the situation changes.
- R. Epp: That's what we've done so far and to find out what we needed to do. We're here asking for feedback. What are you interested in, what would others be interested in? People ask us when it is going to happen.
- R. Huntoon: I know people will come. George Butler used to have barn dances and people came.
- W. Crawford: We want it to be for the community as a collaboration.
- R. Huntoon: It makes sense as an on-going money maker.
- R. Epp: People have to feel included, we want it to be a destination. It doesn't have to be expensive, but similar at a different level so more people can afford it.
- C. Lehner: Do you have any more questions for us at this point? If not, we will look for a site plan review at the appropriate time.
- W. Crawford: We came here to put our cards on the table so we're in compliance with Eleanor.
- C. Lehner: Keep in mind the septic requirements, the floor requirements, and the safety requirements and just keep current with those as you go along.
- D. Bunnell: The best thing that we can tell you is to make sure the fire codes and the septic are the biggest thing. If you can show that all of that can be reached, it seems like it is all doable. I don't see any red flags in any of it. You need to show us that all of the safety issues can be met.
- R. Huntoon: You guys put on one of the best presentations I've seen since I've been on this board. It is clear and concise and you know exactly what you want.
- R. Epp: Thank you very much. I think the property speaks for itself.
- W. Crawford: We want to stress that this is not a 24 hour business that we want. We want a usable venue from April to October. We'll work with Eleanor.

Approval to set-up subcommittee to review Counsel's Zoning Ordinance Review and to bring recommendations to the full board.

- C. Lehner: If you recall, we received a 22 page document from counsel on our zoning ordinances.
- Bob suggested that a sub-committee be formed and include B. Snelling, C. Lehner, E. Hansen.

Motion: "To create a sub-committee to review and bring recommendations about Counsel's Zoning Ordinance suggestions to the full board."

Motion: C. Lehner
Second: D. Bunnell
Discussion: None
Motion Passes 5-yes 0-no 3 absent

Next Meeting - Tuesday, October 16, 2018 at 6:30PM

CORRESPONDENCE: None

ADJOURNMENT: At 7:53 the following motion was made:

Motion: "To adjourn."

Motion: R. Huntoon
Second: C. Lehner
Discussion: None
Motion Passes: 5 - Yes, 0 – No, 3 – Absent

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Levy
Land Use Boards Assistant