

**Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes**  
**DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/ZOOM PLATFORM**  
**September 22, 2021**

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Fracht (Chair), Erik Russell (Vice Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer)

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** Phil Vermeer

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

**GUESTS:** Scott Sanborn (Cardigan Mountain Land Surveys, LLC), S. R. Kovacs, Heather Green (Liberty Utilities, via Zoom platform).

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**

Chair Fracht called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and took a “roll call” of members present. He noted that as Mr. Vermeer would not be present, Mr. Bonner would be a voting member for this meeting.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

**III. SELECTBOARD REPORT:**

Ms. Stewart shared that the Selectboard met Monday, September 21.

A primary discussion was the proposed resolution relative to the use of face coverings. There was concern from at least one member of the public on the importance of an ordinance. There was additional detail from Chief Holland with regard to no enforcement of neighboring ordinances. The Selectboard directed Mr. Wozmak to develop a solution that would include: educating the public and possibly education sessions, suggesting masks be worn when physical distancing is not possible. Ms. Stewart clarified that this would be a resolution, and not an ordinance. The resolution will have no penalty. The policy of requiring masks in town buildings will remain.

Trustee Hackman of Trust Funds asked to step down and have Ms. Crate appointed in her place as Trustee of Trust Funds. The Selectboard did appoint Ms. Crate to the position.

The Selectboard discussed implementing a modern phone system for the town. The updated system will have VoIP, voicemail-to-email, etc. to make remote work easier. Overall the system will be a better working system as well.

The Selectboard meeting schedule for 2022 was reviewed and adjusted.

**IV. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: September 8, 2021**

**Mr. Kiley *MOVED* to approve the September 8, 2021 Minutes presented in the September 22, 2021 agenda packet as presented and amended.**

***Seconded by Ms. Jones***

**Amendments:**

Line 87- “have the same confidence” to “sub-committee did not have the same confidence about UVLSRP”

Master planning section – Chair Fracht to Co-Chair Fracht

Line 153 – “community members” to “applicant”

Line 154 – remove “case” and “meeting”

Line 304 – clarify “shared a recent discussion of potential sale of the Shed St property” and “increased density from what is allowed in current zoning”.

**Roll Call Vote:**

David Fracht (Chair), Erik Russell (Vice Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer) **all voting Yea.**

**None voted Nay.**

**None Abstained.**

***\* The Vote on the MOTION was approved (7-0).***

**V. HEARINGS:**

**A. Enfield Land Use Case #P21-09-02:** The S. R. Kovacs Living Trust is seeking minor subdivision approval to create two lots at 429 Lockhaven Road (Tax Map 16, Lot 12). One of 12.07+/- acres to be called “Lot 1” and another of 163+/- acres to be called “Lot 2,” out of approximately 175-acre parcel. The subject property is located in the “R3” zoning district and is owned by the S. R. Kovacs Living Trust.

Mr. Gotthardt recused himself from this case as he is an abutter to the property.

Mr. Sanborn stated that the summary covered the case well. He reviewed the two-lot minor subdivision with the board. The proposed Lot 1 12.07+/- acre property is to be around the existing homestead, and the remainder of the acreage would be for proposed Lot 2. He noted that the proposed access to Lot 2 would be a 50’ access point from Lockhaven Rd, as this would not have frontage on a class V road for access. He also shared that this had been a previous conceptual discussion, and that the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) had approved a variance for the 50’ access strip from Lockhaven Rd. Mr. Sanborn shared that he had included soil mapping and topography only on the 12.07+/- acre lot to show it is appropriate on its own. He had not done this for the larger lot but assumed due to the size that it would stand as its own property without issue.

Chair Fracht shared that the board had recently discovered in the zoning regulations that “street frontage” access is only for a town-maintained road. He felt that the definitions were clear, and that since the 50’ strip would not satisfy the 100’ frontage requirement, and he would like to see the subdivision reconfigured as a result of this.

Mr. Gotthardt, as a member of the public, noted that he agreed with Chair Fracht regarding the fact that zoning regulations do not allow road frontage on a class VI road. He shared that any future development of the larger lot would require a private road, and that having a private road built and at least 100’ long would satisfy the 100’ frontage requirement. Chair Fracht agreed. Mr. Kiley noted that he would also agree. He also said that Mr. Kovacs would only need to show the 100’ private road on the plat, this would satisfy the board. He would not have to build it at this time.

Mr. Sanborn said, if the board will accept this proposed Private Road on paper only, he would adjust the drafting plan to label the entire strip as a private way. If Mr. Kovacs is comfortable with his, he is comfortable with it. Mr. Kiley noted that yes, however if it is ever to be built it would need to be built to town standards as a road. Mr. Kovacs said that he assumed this was a likely solution and agreed with it. Mr. Sanborn confirmed, if the board is happy to have him label the private way he will do so prior to submitting the drafting plan.

Mr. Gotthardt asked – if the proposed private road stopped at 100’, because it is part of the property, is it possible to count this as frontage? He stated that the road has to be its own separate way in his opinion. Mr. Kiley stated that only the 100’ is needed to satisfy the frontage requirement, and beyond that he could build a driveway if he so chose with current zoning regulations. Mr. Sanborn stated that regardless if the 100’ strip serves only a single lot, or many in the future – the ownership is irrelevant. At some point, any private way that exists is on land that is owned by someone. He added that he could do some shading in the 50’ strip to make it clear where the proposed private way is for both the board now and anyone looking to make adjustments in the future. Chair Fracht stated that he is comfortable with this. Mr. Russell asked for clarification, even if only a single-family home is to be built in the 100+ acre parcel, the 100’ private road has to be built to town standards – even if it is used only as a driveway? Mr. Kiley stated yes. Mr. Russell clarified enforcement of the road is needed any time something is to be built on the property, even if only a single home using it as a driveway. Mr. Sanborn noted the board would like to see the first 100’ of the private way to be built to town standards noted on the plat. Chair Fracht agreed. Mr. Kovacs noted that he was comfortable with this.

**Mr. Kiley MOVED to accept the subdivision with the condition that a minimum of 100’ of town-standard road be shown on the plat and on the condition of state approval of a septic system.**

**Seconded by Mr. Russell**

**Roll Call Vote:**

David Fracht (Chair), Erik Russell (Vice Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer) **all voting Yea.**

**None voted Nay.**

Kurt Gotthardt **Abstained.** (he is an abutter)

*\* The Vote on the MOTION was approved (6-0-1).*

**B. Enfield Land Use Case #P21-09-01:** Notice is hereby given that the Enfield Planning Board will hold a public hearing pursuant to RSA 231:158 concerning designated scenic roads in the Town of Enfield. The meeting will be held online via the Zoom Web Meeting platform on Wednesday, September 22, 2021, at 7:00 PM. A PRESENTATION and HEARING will be held regarding an application from Liberty Utilities to cut vegetation on the following Scenic Roads in Enfield: Eastman Hill Road and Boys Camp Road.

Mr. Taylor introduced Ms. Green

**B1 – PRESENTATION:** Ms. Green shared that Liberty Utilities does cycle work every 4 years to adjust the vegetation along lines, and this year Eastman Hill Road and Boys Camp Road are up for adjustment. Liberty Utilities has highlighted the pruning, flat cutting of saplings and shrubs, and removals that are planned and summarized the removals at the end of the report. She shared that in some cases removal makes more sense than pruning. Overall, they are asking permission to move forward with routine maintenance work. She asked the board for any questions.

**B2 – HEARING:** Ms. Stewart asked, in section c) subsection 3) – the current practice regarding the ANSI A300 guidelines has not been followed. “Rooster tailing” has been done with the side mower to remove lower fronds which is not allowed. She stated that instead of mowing the fronds, they would be better off removing the entire trees. She noted that she feels the company doing the mowing is not complying with the spirit of this. Ms. Green asked for clarification of the statement. Ms. Stewart shared that the overview covered three things: topping, lions-tailing (removing an excessive number of inter-lateral branches), and rooster-tailing. Ms. Stewart shared that her concern is whether the company doing the work is complying with or avoiding these guidelines. Ms. Green stated that it is the expectation of Liberty Utilities that the company who will do the work will adhere to the professional standards for guidance. She stated that they do have a challenge sometimes with trees that, because of this rule, should be removed rather than pruned, but they may not get the clearance to remove them. She stated that they do their best but do have a funding issue with removal of some of these trees. Ms. Stewart stated that the boards concern would be that they are following acceptable practices which they are saying they will. Ms. Green confirmed.

Chair Fracht asked for any further questions. There were none. No further action is required of the board.

**VI. OLD BUSINESS:**

172 A. Mr. Gotthardt shared an update on the proposed zoning changes that he had been working on.  
173 He noted sections included street frontage and signs. He is looking for feedback and hoping not  
174 to have this slip through. Chair Fracht stated that since this was not on the agenda, he is not  
175 prepared to discuss it. His impression is that the board will have a work session at the first  
176 meeting in October to discuss further. Ms. Stewart agreed if it is on a future agenda, she will  
177 come prepared with feedback. Mr. Gotthardt shared he had been forwarding updates to Mr.  
178 Taylor and has seen them sent to the board, all members agreed they had been receiving them.

179  
180 Chair Fracht stated, the board will have a work session at the first Planning Board meeting in  
181 October, with no hearings scheduled that meeting.

182  
183 B. Ms. Jones stated with regard to Rules of Procedure, the document had not been signed yet.  
184 Mr. Taylor stated that he had copies ready to be signed with all changes. The board agreed to  
185 sign the changes at tonight's meeting. Mr. Taylor provided copies to the board for review and  
186 sign a single copy.

187  
188 C. Mr. Taylor shared that the ZBA approved the variance for Mr. Kovacs, and also approved the  
189 special exception for commercial equestrian for Ms. Sipe, who will be in to the Planning Board  
190 soon. He also shared that the ZBA had a meeting with general counsel on the Pettola case. Ms.  
191 Jones asked for clarification of the case. Mr. Taylor shared it had been for a variance for a deck  
192 and stairs which had been built with no variance and with no building permit. The ZBA denied  
193 the variance, and the case was taken to Superior Court. The court's decision was that the ZBA  
194 must approve the variance. He stated that the ZBA approved the variance with use only for  
195 emergency egress/ingress and that it is to be removed when the property owner's son using it no  
196 longer needs it, it cannot be used for recreation, etc. Mr. Taylor stated also that the ZBA decision  
197 would be filed with the Grafton County Registry of Deeds as well to prevent the deck from being  
198 sold with the property in the future.

199  
200 D. Mr. Taylor shared that there was another ZBA denial regarding a Shaker Hill Rd. auto repair  
201 business. A garage was built to be residential, and then the owner opened a business there. In the  
202 case the property owner asked for a home-based business, which Mr. Taylor ruled would not be  
203 appropriate. Property abutters are very upset as well. Mr. Taylor noted the property owners had a  
204 variance denied and were sent certified letters. He also gave extra time to appeal and has been  
205 told by the property owner that he is shutting down his business. It does not appear to be the case  
206 at this time. At this point proof is needed that business has taken place at this location. Chair  
207 Fracht asked, who is taking down license plates on a regular basis? Mr. Taylor noted that he  
208 would be, and the police department would be as well. Mr. Taylor also shared that the shipping  
209 container that is located at the property is in violation and was told by the property owner that it  
210 would be removed and is meant to be temporary storage only.

211  
212 **VII. CONCEPTUALS:**

213 None.

214  
215 **VIII. UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING TASK FORCE WORK**

216 Co-Chair Fracht shared that the Master Planning Task Force (MPTF) continues to work on a  
217 community-wide survey. The most recent meeting session included a review of the questions and  
218 edits by task force members. He noted that the basic theme of the review was “why are we  
219 asking this question, what do we hope to get out of it, and is this biased or leading?” The MPTF  
220 will continue to review and edit at the next meeting on Monday, September 27.

221  
222 He shared that there are also pens. He noted there are several in the conference room, and all  
223 MPTF members have received them to help leave around town.

224  
225 On Monday, September 21, Co-Chair Fracht, Mr. Vermeer, and Ms. Aufiero had visited  
226 downtown Bristol. The visit included a 1.5-hour walking tour of downtown Bristol and a  
227 meeting with either the town administrator or manager. There are many similarities with Enfield:  
228 population size, lake area, river through the center of town, stable population over the past few  
229 decades, declining school population and aging population, one large employer (manufacturing).  
230 He shared that he felt that had a vibrant downtown area, quite a few shops and eateries in their  
231 commercial sector. He shared that they are also near a ski area, so they have pass-through traffic  
232 from that in the winter. They plan to work out co-marketing arrangements with the ski area  
233 (perhaps coupons to stop for dinner in town as an example). Co-Chair Fracht shared they had  
234 also put together several websites, one for those looking to move or new to town, and another is  
235 more focused on the downtown commercial activity. Co-Chair Fracht stated he felt Enfield could  
236 do a lot of they could define the commercial/downtown area and keep it compact. He feels that  
237 an important push will be for redevelopment on Main St. He said that it seems like a nice little  
238 town, and with some out-of-the-box thinking and land owner cooperation in Enfield’s Main St.  
239 area, it may be possible in 10, 15 years for Enfield’s Main St to be transformed into a similar  
240 hub.

241  
242 Ms. Stewart noted she saw two major differences between Bristol and Enfield. One being that  
243 the major employer in Bristol runs 3 shifts, so there are a lot of employees there who utilize their  
244 Main St. Another major difference is that their traffic goes through Main St., and Enfield’s is not  
245 set up this way. She noted she felt the importance of “magnet business” to attract people. Mr.  
246 Gotthardt stated he didn’t feel it necessarily needed to be a business. Other features like parks,  
247 rail trail, etc. can draw people in. With regard to the rail trail and the river park, there are nice  
248 places to explore but where to park, what to do, how to get there are not well outlined.

249  
250 Ms. Stewart shared that in her experiences in various meetings with businesses in town, there  
251 appears to be a similar goal of unifying the separate town/business areas. Walking tours or  
252 similar that are fun and informative would be important. Co-Chair Fracht shared, Bristol has  
253 very good signage, and the area is well cared for. He feels there is a lot Enfield can learn from

254 them. Ms. Jones asked, do you feel that because of the large employer they are getting taxes  
255 from that employer and have more funding? Co-Chair Fracht shared, he believed a lot of what  
256 had been done was done through grant money. He stated they had been able to leverage tax  
257 money with grant money. Ms. Stewart shared that the Enfield Master Plan will help with making  
258 plans here.

259  
260 Mr. Gotthardt shared, another thing he has noticed with regard to these small towns – it seems to  
261 come down to the attitude of the people that serve on the boards and the general public.

262  
263 Mr. Kiley shared that Bristol has a large arts community. Mr. Taylor shared that they also have a  
264 large lakeside community compared to Enfield. Ms. Stewart shared that she feels it is clear that  
265 Bristol is open to new ideas. Enfield is working on striking a balance of fusing history with new  
266 ideas, which is not always easy in the current climate.

267  
268 Mr. Gotthardt shared another town to look at is Gorham, NH. Ms. Stewart shared Lincoln and  
269 Woodstock also have mixed architecture like Enfield does. She said that an issue in Enfield is  
270 that the major town areas as so separated. She suggested considering some kind of trails that go  
271 from Whaleback and Montcalm through to the Shaker Fields area. She noted she is excited about  
272 the potential and the information learned from the MPTF members visiting Bristol. Chair Fracht  
273 stated he felt Enfield members would be welcome to go back and do a walking tour.

274  
275 The consultant is set to come onboard around October 1<sup>st</sup>. Once the consultant is on board, he  
276 hope is that she will provide more direction and help with regard to the survey and other public  
277 engagement activities. Co-Chair Fracht said, he feels confident they are going in the right  
278 direction and working toward their goal in making people aware of the Master Plan. The hope is  
279 that the upcoming educational sessions will help start some dialogue.

280  
281 Ms. Jones asked, is there a schedule for the educational sessions? Chair Fracht noted that Co-  
282 Chair Smith had said they would be available on the Enfield LEAPS website next week.

283  
284 Mr. Gotthardt stated that he felt the lakeside requirements were differing with regard to land use.  
285 Co-Chair Fracht shared that the current focus is more of an overview, and in the future, it will be  
286 “zoomed in” more to investigate these things.

287  
288 Mr. Gotthardt shared, it would be nice to have a list of the different roads in town and the  
289 classifications of them. Co-Chair Fracht shared he felt the Enfield LEAPS website has a map of  
290 that. Mr. Gotthardt noted he felt the private roads were important to add to this. Co-Chair Fracht  
291 stated he was not sure if they were on there.

292  
293 Co-Chair Fracht asked, did we show the graphics to this group? The board agreed they had  
294 previously seen them. Co-Chair Fracht shared that there were some updates. Mr. Taylor

projected the updated graphics. The board suggested keeping all graphics as bar charts for consistency and ease of understanding.

**IX. NEXT MEETING:** October 13, 2021

**X. ADJOURNMENT:**

*A MOTION was made by Kiley to adjourn the meeting at 8:43 p.m.*

*The MOTION was seconded by Ms. Stewart.*

**Roll Call Vote:**

David Fracht (Chair), Erik Russell (Vice Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer) **all voting Yea.**

**None voted Nay.**

**None Abstained.**

*\* The Vote on the MOTION was approved (7-0).*

Respectfully submitted,

Whitney Banker

Recording Secretary