

Enfield Planning Board Minutes, February 28, 2024

Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes

DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/MICROSOFT TEAMS

February 28, 2024

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley (Vice-Chair), Erik Russell (Selectboard Representative), Phil Vermeer, Tim Jennings (Secretary), Brad Rich, Kurt Gotthardt (Alternate), Jim Bonner (Alternate and Videographer), Whitney Banker (Alternate)

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Linda Jones

STAFF PRESENT: Rob Taylor- Land Use and Community Development Administrator, Whitney Banker-Recording Secretary

GUESTS: Carl and Cari Lovejoy (via Teams), Lisa and Dick Drummond (via Teams), Affrille Degoma (via Teams), Lisa Ransom, Cameron Roberts, Phil Neily, Steve Whitman (Resilience Planning & Design, via Teams), Mark Fougere (Mark Fougere Planning & Development, via Teams), Kevin O'Reilly, Sara Roberts, Jay Boucher, Chris Ross (Pathways Consulting), Catherine Patch Parker

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Chair Fracht called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and took attendance of members.

Chair Fracht elevated Mr. Gotthardt to a voting member for tonight's hearings.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Chair Fracht called for public comment for any items not on the agenda.

With none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

III. HEARINGS

P24-02-03 Cameron and Sara Roberts – Minor Subdivision

Chair Fracht read the case.

Mr. Roberts shared that he and Ms. Roberts currently reside in the home at 804 Shaker Hill Road and are looking to subdivide the lot into two. They plan to build a house and have a hobby farm on the larger proposed lot.

Mr. Taylor shared that the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) granted a request for variance relief from Enfield Zoning Ordinance, Article IV, section 401.2, paragraph K to subdivide a lot of less than 3 acres on September 12, 2023.

Mr. Gotthardt wondered if the scaling measurements were off. Chair Fracht noted that they did seem off and reiterated that the Mylar map should be corrected.

Ms. Degoma asked if the zoning would remain residential. Chair Fracht confirmed it would be.

With no further questions or comments, Chair Fracht closed the public hearing.

Mr. Rich moved to discuss the application. Mr. Kiley seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

With no further discussion, Chair Fracht moved on to the next motion.

Mr. Kiley moved to approve the subdivision as submitted. Mr. Rich seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

P24-02-04 Tardiff Hall at Shaker Village, LLC Major Site Plan Review

Chair Fracht read the case.

Chair Fracht invited the applicant and his representative, Mr. Ross (Pathways Consulting, LLC), to explain which portion of the property will be proposed for the residential use of four units. Mr. Ross explained that it was on the left side of the building from the midpoint, approximately 1900sf per floor. The right side of the building will maintain its commercial use.

Chair Fracht asked the board if they wished to ask that the application be modified to clarify that only part of the building was to be converted for residential use. Mr. Kiley suggested it be a condition of approval. Board members agreed.

Mr. Ross explained the proposed changes. A new entry point at the west end of the building will be added for access to the residential units. The current central/east side entrance will maintain its function as the business entrance. Parking will be improved for the designated residential areas, with two spots per unit, along the southeast section of the building, along Chosen Vale Lane. Some places will be maintained for business use along the east end of the building, as well as the double-row lot and parking along the north side of the building. A loading dock along the northwest side will maintain its current function.

New lighting will be added at entry points and along the parking areas. Additional plantings will be added to call better attention to entry/exit points. Tree cover is present along the southeastern side of the building and the north side. Loam, shade, mulch, and new deciduous trees are mentioned throughout the site plan.

83 Mr. Boucher is the business owner of Defiance Electric and property owner. Mr. Taylor said that
84 the use change would likely reduce traffic that existed with full commercial use of the property.
85

86 Chair Fracht said that he is curious about the property's history. It is an R1 residential area, and
87 he wondered when the building went to commercial use. Mr. Boucher and others have used the
88 building for commercial use since 1986. Chair Fracht noted that the use was before zoning and,
89 therefore, grandfathered.
90

91 Mr. Gotthardt said he did not see a symbol map on the plat and asked for a review of the symbols
92 or a key.
93

94 Mr. Jennings asked if the lot was part of any homeowner's associations. Mr. Boucher said that
95 the lot is part of the Lower Shaker Village Association and is on their municipal water system.
96

97 Each proposed housing unit is about 900 sf and has two bedrooms, two bathrooms, and a
98 kitchen. The apartments will be in the Shaker Village style. The building will have sprinklers
99 and upgraded energy, including heat pumps with backup heat.
100

101 Mr. Russell asked if the board needed to do anything regarding sewer hookup fees. Mr. Taylor
102 said they would work with Mr. J. Taylor at the Department of Public Works (DPW).
103

104 Ms. Patch said that as an Enfield resident, she has worked with Defiance Electric and finds them
105 easy to work with and fair partners in the community. She also echoed the need for housing in
106 this area and supported their proposal.
107

108 Ms. Lovejoy asked if traffic between Chosen Vale and Caleb Dyer lanes could have a stop or
109 yield sign added. Chair Fracht suggested this be brought to the homeowner's association if it is
110 within that area. Mr. Boucher said there was a recent grounds committee meeting to address this
111 with residents.
112

113 Ms. Lovejoy asked if renters would join the association. Mr. Boucher said he, as the property
114 owner, is already part of the Lower Shaker Village Association. Mr. Jennings clarified that
115 apartment residents would not be part of the association; only the lot owner would be.
116

117 Mr. Neily asked if calculations had been run on the sprinkler system for the water requirements.
118 Mr. Boucher said that it is in the process right now. Mr. Neily said that he would like to see these
119 once they are available. If the minimum flow for the sprinklers is not met, he believes there
120 would be alternatives that could be discussed if needed.
121

122 Ms. Drummond said her home is directly across from Tardiff Hall and believes they are the most
123 affected by the proposed change. They understand the need for housing and are on board with

124 this. She said that the new entrance for the residential units would be directly across from their
125 home and stated concern about light pollution. Ms. Drummond and Mr. Drummond have lived at
126 their home for 21 years and have never seen 50 cars in the parking lot of the building, even
127 before COVID. She stated her concern that 2-bedroom units could result in 4+ people per unit,
128 and residential use traffic would happen at all hours of the day (not just during business hours).
129 She asked for clarification of the separate proposed entrance.

130
131 Mr. Ross explained that the new entry point is intended to support dividing the property between
132 residential and business use. It uses existing stairwells on that side of the building to provide
133 direct entry for residential functions. It also allows proper fire separation between the business
134 and residential areas. Mr. Ross said there would be significant difficulty isolating staircases if
135 they mixed the entrance for commercial and residential. The other staircase that could be used
136 would pose challenges to restricting business and residential access areas and is less
137 straightforward. Mr. Ross clarified that the new entry point is on the southwest corner of the
138 building, with existing windows that will become the new entry point.

139
140 Mr. Ross said that he believed they could investigate more intense full-cutoff lighting and would
141 be happy to adjust the lighting plans for entry and exit points. Mr. Ross also stated they will
142 supply the proposed lighting details to the Drummonds. Mr. Ross also stated that they feel it is
143 appropriate to add blinds that can be shut in the evening to all areas of the building. Mr. Ross
144 recognized that the construction lighting currently being used is very bright, and if the
145 construction lighting may also need to be adjusted, they can investigate doing this.

146
147 Mr. Ross said that the open-space note is regarding the area in general (open spaces throughout
148 the village, such as walkable roads, play areas, etc.).

149
150 Mr. Ross agreed that traffic use patterns would be different from what they have been and would
151 happen around the clock with residential use. He suggested that they could come up with
152 rules/regulations for renters, including which entry points should be used for traffic to the
153 building.

154
155 Ms. Drummond said that they remain concerned about the volume of traffic, headlights shining
156 into their windows, etc. She also stated that she is unclear about the open spaces. She believed
157 that those mentioned were part of the northern village. Chair Fracht stated that this would not be
158 something that the Planning Board would regulate and that it should be discussed with the
159 appropriate associations.

160
161 Mr. Boucher stated that he did not feel adding residential apartments would have any different
162 impact on the community than building homes currently being done. Ms. Drummond asked if
163 there would be restrictions on how many people could live in each unit. Mr. Boucher said that

they are only 900sf. Chair Fracht stated that multi-family use is allowed by right in the zoning ordinance for this district.

Ms. Drummond said that shifting the entrance for the residential units will significantly impact their home and would appreciate them reconsidering this. Mr. Boucher said that they cannot change this due to the location of the existing stairwell. Mr. Gotthardt noted that the zoning regulations and board also would be unable to restrict this.

Mr. Gotthardt asked about the preexisting exterior lighting. He stated that he believed that even grandfathered property lighting needs to be updated to full cutoff when there is a change of use. Mr. Boucher agreed they would be sure to reduce impacts and update all lighting.

With no further questions for comments from board members or the public, Chair Fracht closed the public hearing.

Motion to discuss – Vermeer

Second – Jennings

Mr. Vermeer moved to discuss the application. Mr. Jennings seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

Mr. Jennings said there is an R1 district with a ¼-acre minimum lot size (since the lot is served by municipal sewer), and he wondered what determined the number of units that can be put in a building. The board has previously discussed this. Chair Fracht asked if this could be put aside for a later discussion and stick to direct questions about the application. Mr. Gotthardt clarified the lots in question are over 1 acre, so this would not be an issue for discussion tonight. Board members agreed with this clarification.

Chair Fracht reviewed the conditions of the board:

- add map symbol key to plat

- convert all exterior lights to full cutoff and provide a complete light plan

- include window treatments

- provide fire suppression sprinkler flow report for Chief Neily.

Mr. Gotthardt moved to approve the application with the conditions stated. Mr. Vermeer seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

IV. CONCEPTUALS

Phil Neily – Enfield Fire Department Re: Lakeview Fire Protection

Chief Neily said that Lakeview had received a grant to upgrade its water system, which the town is not involved in. However, there are fire hydrants in the subdivision that he believed would have been approved by the Planning Board when it was initially created.

Chief Neily gave an overview of the fire hydrant locations and explained that the water lines were picking up bacteria that pose an issue if the hydrants are not regularly flushed. Lakeview has asked if the fire department has any problems moving from 2 lines to a single line. Chief Neily said he did not find any issue as long as the same volume of water was available. Mr. Kiley stated that the development would be pre-zoning. Board members felt this would not be something the board needed to weigh in on but understood the due diligence of the fire chief.

The project is in the final engineering phase. Chair Fracht said he believed the board could only say that if it has been engineered and approved, it is beyond its purview.

Mr. Russell suggested that the new system plan be appended to the site plan if there is one.

V. SELECTBOARD REPORT: Erik Russell

The Selectboard's last meeting was a public hearing for SB2.

VI. LEGISLATIVE REPORT: David Fracht

A proposed bill would add solid-waste management as a chapter to the master plan. This will go to the full house for a vote and will likely proceed to the Senate and governor.

A previously reported bill that would give planning boards quasi-judicial authority is likely to end at the committee level as a result of researching recent court cases. A hearing that requires notice means the board is already acting as a quasi-judicial body.

NH HOP GRANT DISCUSSION

Mr. Whitman directed the board to the draft changes document he had provided for discussion.

Mr. Rich commented that he appreciated the document format; it was easy to understand and nicely laid out.

Mr. Jennings asked if the board should discuss potential overlay districts in the village versus combining them. He wanted to ensure the district list reflected what the town eventually wanted to have in the ordinance. Mr. Jennings also noted that the historic overlay district in Enfield Center should be added to the district list.

Mr. Jennings asked if overlay districts for Eastman, Shaker Village, and Enfield Center were something the board intended. Board members agreed that Eastman and Shaker Village would be overlays, to note that their respective boards. Members agreed that Enfield Center may not be an overlay. Regarding Shaker Village, the board discussed that they would be subject to the standard lake district requirements, and the overlay would be for the HOA, which is more restrictive.

Enfield Planning Board Minutes, February 28, 2024

Board members discussed the proposed rural district's purpose and permitted uses. Members agreed that keeping permitted use open as "residential" was best. The consensus was that the land would restrict use (such as how many units wells and septic systems can serve).

Concerns were raised about multi-family housing in the proposed Commercial/Industrial district and school bus access (particularly along the I89 corridor at exit 15; exit 16 already has Methodist Hill Road, which has a school bus route).

Additional discussion took place to clarify questions for permitted uses of the districts and adjust language and instances of special exception.

Mr. Whitman asked the board to consider whether they wanted the residential district to be more residential or to allow businesses (such as a daycare center) by conditional use permit rather than special exception. Conditional use permits are not appealable to the ZBA.

Mr. Whitman and Mr. Fougere will send Mr. Taylor updated changes based on tonight's discussion to share with the board.

Mr. Fougere will review the proposed lines for the village district at tomorrow's stakeholder meeting.

Mr. Jennings asked the consultants to provide a list of land-use ordinance definitions they regularly use (such as commercial recreation). Mr. Whitman and Mr. Fougere each did not have specific lists but recommended an American Planning Association book with some definitions.

Mr. Jennings asked for a modal zoning ordinance outline with headings to show formatting. Mr. Whitman said they typically work section by section. These vary by town.

LAND USE ADMINISTRATOR REPORT: Rob Taylor

An application has been received for Laramie Farms for two variances (1 for height and 1 for buildings per lot). These will go to the ZBA's meeting on March 12.

A new developer has shown new interest in the 45-acre lot behind Pellerin Auto.

The Town of Enfield's two site plan review applications will come to the next Planning Board meeting.

VIII. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: February 14, 2024

Mr. Kiley moved to approve the February 14, 2024, minutes, as presented. Mr. Rich seconded. Vote in favor of the motion with two abstentions (5-0-2).

287

288 **NEXT MEETING:** March 13, 2024

289

290 **ADJOURNMENT:**

291 **Mr. Kiley moved to adjourn. Mr. Rich seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-**
292 **0).**

293

294 The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 pm.