

**TOWN OF HOLDERNESS
PLANNING BOARD
Tuesday,
April 21, 2020 6:30 P.M.**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: R. Snelling called the meeting held via Zoom to order at 6:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

Members Present: Robert Snelling, Chair; Carl Lehner, Vice Chair; Peter Francesco, Ex-Officio, Donna Bunnell, Secretary; Ronald Huntoon, Member (joined meeting after Case 20-3-3); Angi Francesco, Member; Louis Pare, Member; Janet Cocchiaro, raised to regular (voting) member for Case 20-3-3

NOTE: All members were home and were alone.

Members Not Present:

Staff Present: Linda Levy, Land Use Board Assistant

Others Present: Roger LaRochelle

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The draft of the minutes of the February 18, 2020 meeting was reviewed and edited.

Motion: "To accept the minutes as edited."

Motion: C. Lehner

Second: D. Bunnell

Discussion: No further discussion

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-abstention 1-absent

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Case 20-3-3: Property owners Squam Lakes Conservation Society request a lot merger so that lot 237-029-000 (30 acres) merges with lot 237 Burleigh or Webster Rangeway (6 acres) to create one lot equaling 36 acres.

R. LaRocelle: explained the lot merger; the Pulsifer property was a gift; it had a geodesic dome that was demolished; the area was cleaned by Randy Eastman; the merger is with the Webster Rangeway which was never going to be used as a road but was supposed to be used as access to the Burleigh Corporation land; the SLCS acquired the rangeway (6 acres) which was shown on the tax maps as belonging to Aziz, but he does not own that property, he owns parcels on either side of the rangeway; they have submitted an application for current use.

Questions: is the rangeway a right-of-way? (it is a common area used to access other back lands); is the land locked? (yes); do the lots behind this property stay landlocked? (Aziz has a right-of-way); does the conservation easement prevent Aziz from improving his land? (there is no easement, there are no restrictions for Aziz or the other abutters)

Motion: "To accept the application."

Motion: A. Francesco

Second: R. Snelling
Discussion: No further discussion
Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-abstention 1-absent

Motion: "To approve the application."

Motion: C. Lehner
Second: A. Francesco
Discussion: No further discussion
Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-abstention 1-absent

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS: None

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Discussion on Ordinance 400.6.3.3. (con't from 2/18/2020) (Shaded wording indicates suggested changes to the ordinance.)

400.6.3.3: In districts where allowed, commercial signs may be illuminated only between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 10:00 P.M., or during the hours the premises are open to the public. Non-commercial signs such as residential name plate, road, directional, and government signs may remain illuminated. No digital signs, electronic message centers (EMCs), light-emitting diode (LED) signs or electronic billboards of any kind shall be permitted in the Village section of the Commercial District.

R. Snelling offered that there is a new number for that ordinance – 400.6.4.3.

D. Bunnell explained the definitions of digital signs, EMDs and LEDs saying that the terms are synonymous; she feels that these types of signs do not belong in Holderness; the only reason the Golden Pond Country Store got permission was because the gas stations on Rt. 175A were allowed to have those signs.

Comments/questions: where should the limits of this ordinance be, should they go beyond the Commercial Village District? (opinions included using the Ashland Town Line or Cottage Place as the limits which would include the Boulder's Motel, the Town Hall, the Inn on Golden Pond, Squam Lakeside Campground, the marine repair shop, etc); all districts allow signs, so this implies that in some districts some signs may not be allowed; this ordinance is not intended to restrict signs in other districts; suggestion to delete the phrase "where allowed"; suggestion to allow neon signs or signs lit from within or a sign with a light shining on it; what would happen if there were new technologies?; suggestion to check to see what other towns and the Lakes Region Planning Commission are doing (D. Bunnell agreed to do this).

Decision: to continue discussion at the May meeting.

2. Discussion of the Squam Lake Watershed Management Plan and the Conservation Commission Master Plan

Recommendation	Discussion Points
Vernal pool, Wetland inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are in the process of consolidating the two maps on our website. • There are wetlands that are not on either map. • Surveying each property would show wetlands and vernal pools. • Why is the Planning Board duplicating the work of the Conservation Commission? • Rules have to be enforced; the Town does not have an enforcement officer. • The Conservation Commission must follow the master plan so a note on the wetlands and vernal pools is important. • Recommendation: Continue to protect our wetlands and vernal pools through our ordinances. • Recommendation: Protect our wetlands and vernal pools through education (should be listed with Outreach and Education).
Collaboration with other organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Continue to work with surrounding communities and citizen organizations to address common natural resource preservation, conservation and low impact recreation goals.
Trail network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The original plan was to create a bicycle network from the Holderness Central School to the Howe Town Forest. • No recommendation (should be part of transportation)
Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Enforcement • Recommendation: Increase awareness and enforcement of current ordinances, particularly as they apply to the natural resources.
Views list	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There already is a list of view sites. • We need to continue to protect the views that we have. • Recommendation: Continue to protect the views as much as practicable. Continue to maintain inventory of views to be preserved as a natural resource. The inventory can be found on the town website.
Areas of special interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommendation focused on the area between Prospect Mountain and the Pemi. • Recommendation: We should look at the Town as a whole.
Town property in conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Conservation Commission is proposing that we take Town properties and put them into conservation easement so the property cannot be sold. • The Town Shed/Highway Department might need more property so the Town Forest property needs that consideration. • Recommendation: Put the town conservation and recreation properties into conservation easements.

Continue dark skies initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PSU fields have lighting, but State properties do not have to comply with this recommendation. • Recommendation: Continue to support town's "Dark Skies" initiative.
Sewer system Little Squam, Shepard Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommendation focused on putting a sewer line along Rt. 3 and maybe up Shepard Hill. • There are no grant monies available to support this system. • Recommendation: We do not support this recommendation.
Rattlesnake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is managed by the SLA. • The SLA has trail hosts to share conservation efforts. • The SLA has recommended alternative hiking spots to relieve the pressure on Rattlesnake. • Recommendation: This should be part of collaboration with other organizations.
More restrictive ordinances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommendation focused on setback requirements, lot size, frontage, etc. • We have a larger frontage requirement than the State. • We need a balance between reasonable growth and restrictions. • We have a broader set of standards than many other towns. • The current standards are adequate and reasonable. • Some properties have taken advantage of the ordinances to try to bend the rules. • We can be more restrictive than the State. • This is all dependent on having enforcement (see enforcement).
Septic survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other towns have done this to put this information into the State records. • The purpose is to identify systems that do not meet current standards and to upgrade those systems; to look for systems that are 40-50 years old or those that are too close to the lake and therefore, negatively impacting the lake. • Recommendation: All agreed on doing a septic survey.
Roads standards upgrade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the Select Board's responsibility. • The Select Board adopted it. • Recommendation: This does not need to be in this document. • Recommendation: Update town Best Management Practices for road installation and maintenance to better control erosion and runoff.
Outreach & Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is very general and should be kept.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Attach it to the specific recommendations as well as a stand-alone recommendation. • Recommendation: Enhance public education on Best Management Practices for natural resource protection.
Develop BMPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Road standards upgrade and Outreach & Education.
Water pollution other than nutrients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommendation focused on pesticides, PCBs, DDTs, and other pollutants in the lake. • The SLA highlighted these pollutants in their plan. • There are fish consumption guidelines in Squam Lake. • The SLA is submitting a grant to mitigate contaminants into the lake that involves assessing the road crossings and to ask the State to repair those crossings. • Recommendation: Support efforts to define soil, subsurface and surface water contaminants other than nutrients (e.g. PCBs, Pesticides, etc.). (This recommendation should be part of collaboration with other organizations.)
Shore protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: This recommendation is already part of our ordinances.
Enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have to increase enforcement before we can increase more restrictive ordinances. • Is it financially viable? • See more Restrictive ordinances and Compliance.
Invasive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Support land and aquatic invasive species management.
Complete buildout analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue the portion that is in Holderness to provide a baseline for growth and optimum places to save. • The SLA provides an analysis for the most vulnerable part of the Town. • The SLA has suggested more restrictions. • The 2007 Master Plan predicted a population boom that we have not seen, therefore the buildout analysis is an unnecessary expense. • Recommendation: Members need more information before supporting this recommendation.

R. Snelling suggested a sub-committee made up of R. Snelling, J. Cocchiaro, and C. Lehner to take the bullet points above and put them into sentences for recommendations. Editorial changes to the document also need to be made. They will bring the final draft of the natural resources chapter to the May meeting along with their suggestions for Board discussion and vote. There will be a public hearing in June if the Board approves the suggestions at the May meeting.

3. Next Meeting - Tuesday, May 19, 2020 at 6:30 P.M.

CORRESPONDENCE: None

ADJOURNMENT: At 8:53 P.M. the following motion was made.

Motion: "To adjourn."

Motion: R. Snelling

Second: D. Bunnell

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-absention 0-absent

Respectfully submitted,

Linda S. Levy

Land Use Boards Assistant