

Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes
DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/ZOOM PLATFORM
October 13, 2021

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

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

GUESTS: Celie Aufiero, Angus Durocher

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 for attendance.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

III. SELECTBOARD REPORT:

Ms. Stewart shared that the Selectboard met October 4, 2021. The meeting was short. Mr. Gotthardt did a quick presentation about streaming municipal meetings. That action item for streaming the meetings was assigned to Mr. Durocher.

The new fire chief, Mr. Neily gave an update on operations, the rescue pumper, and a slight expense overrun for radio/CIP expense. The overrun should not be an issue.

There was a draft resolution relative to face coverings discussed, which was circulated later via email and posted by the Town Manager’s office. The resolution asks that those in town wear masks, and the policy of requiring masks for meetings in town offices stands.

There was a conversation about conservation commission membership.

Ms. Stewart asked for further questions. There were none.

39
40 **IV. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: September 22, 2021**
41

42 ***Mr. Kiley MOVED to approve the September 22, 2021, Minutes presented in the October***
43 ***13, 2021, agenda packet as presented and amended.***

44 ***Seconded by Ms. Jones***
45

46 **Amendments:**

47 Line 88 – remove double negative

48 Line 92 – “or” between complying with/avoiding

49 Line 98 – change “Ms. Green stated yes” to “Ms. Green confirmed”

50 Line 109 – “case was heard first at the meeting” clarification – remove sentence, adjust order
51 of cases to reflect how they were heard at the meeting.
52

53 **Roll Call Vote:**

54 David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Erik Russell, Kate Plumley
55 Stewart (Selectboard representative) **all voting Yea.**

56 **None voted Nay.**

57 **Phil Vermeer Abstained.**
58

59 **** The Vote on the MOTION was approved (6-0-1).***
60

61 **V. HEARINGS:**

62 None.
63

64 **VI. OLD BUSINESS:**

65 None.
66

67 **VII. CONCEPTUALS:**

68 None.
69

70 **VIII. UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING TASK FORCE WORK:** David Fracht, Co-Chair
71 MPTF.
72

73 Co-Chair Fracht shared that the Master Planning Task Force met Monday, October 11, 2021.
74 The task force had an opportunity to meet the new consultant, Ms. Saxton of [Place Sense](#) via
75 Zoom platform.
76

77 A fair amount of the meeting was spent discussing the upcoming community survey. Ms. Saxton
78 will review the rough draft of the survey that task force members had been working on at recent
79 meetings. She will compile and order the survey questions for both online and paper format. Ms.

80 Saxton shared that there might be some differences between the two formats, as some formatting
81 online can be done that does not translate to paper.

82
83 Co-Chair Fracht shared that the task force also discussed the upcoming educational series (three
84 sessions are upcoming). The first session was held Thursday, October 7 from 6-8pm. Co-Chair
85 Fracht gave a presentation on What is a Master Plan, which was followed by much discussion
86 and many questions from community members who attended. The main takeaway of the task
87 force was that community members need constant reminding that the master plan is as good as,
88 and dependent upon, the input and stakeholders in the public. The task force, and planning
89 board, do not make decisions about the priorities of the town as part of the plan. The task force is
90 gathering data. Co-Chair Fracht asked Planning Board members to reiterate this if they are
91 talking to community members about the Master Plan and Master Plan Task Force.

92
93 Co-Chair Fracht shared that there was also discussion on the upcoming November community
94 workshop. The discussion ended with the consensus that there would be two, 2.5-3-hour
95 workshops (one AM, and one PM). The workshops would be identical but provide multiple
96 times for community members to attend. Co-Chair Fracht shared that the survey was not going to
97 be circulated prior to this November community workshop. The MPTF had originally hoped to
98 use the survey data to inform how they structure the November meeting. The survey will be
99 circulated as soon as possible.

100
101 Co-Chair Fracht shared that there is also the possibility of doing several additional community
102 workshops going forward. The plan is for the consultant, Ms. Saxton, to have the rough draft of
103 the Master Plan ready for March 2022.

104
105 Co-Chair Fracht also shared updated data from the Question of the Week re: parking. Mr. Taylor
106 projected the bar graph for Planning Board members to review. For the question of where
107 community members would like to see parking, respondents were largely interested in parking in
108 the Enfield Village area, followed by Rt. 4A Boat Launch, Rt. 4A Beach, and Rt. 4 Business
109 District. Mr. Gotthardt commented that it would be helpful for the bar graph's order to reflect the
110 order of intensity. Ms. Stewart also suggested ordering the graph from greatest to least for ease
111 of understanding. Mr. Durocher also suggested potentially grouping them by geographic
112 location. Ms. Stewart asked – could respondents vote for more than one focus? Co-Chair Fracht
113 noted that he believed they could only select one but was not positive. Ms. Stewart suggested
114 combining responses, and that it would also be possible to do multiple graphics to represent the
115 data differently. Co-Chair Fracht noted he had originally followed the way the questions were
116 presented on the original survey. He noted they will make changes and bring to the next meeting
117 for review.

118
119 The next question was what types of housing would community members like to see Enfield
120 encourage? Ms. Jones suggested it would be a good idea to ask another group of people, as

121 responses were very few. Mr. Gotthardt asked where the question was asked? Co-Chair Fracht
122 stated that the survey was available on the website. Co-Chair Fracht stated that he believed
123 respondents could provide up to five responses for this question. There was a large mix of
124 responses. The top housing types of interest were: Single, Elderly, and Duplex. Co-Chair Fracht
125 shared that the MPTF has access to real-time polling software, which they hope to use at the
126 November 6 community workshop.

127
128 Mr. Durocher asked what the meeting is that is happening tomorrow, Thursday, October 14? Co-
129 Chair Fracht clarified that this is the second educational series, which has a focus on Housing,
130 from 6-8pm. He also stated that he felt housing would be a popular topic of conversation at the
131 November 6 community workshop.

132
133 Moving back to the Housing data review, Mr. Gotthardt, Ms. Stewart, and Mr. Durocher shared
134 corrections to representation of the data. Ms. Stewart also suggested a spelling correction.

135
136 The next question was whether community members would be open to new types of housing in
137 their neighborhoods. Responses were varied with many saying Yes, some saying No, and some
138 saying Yes, but not in my neighborhood” or “other”. The responses were varied, with the
139 majority saying Yes. Mr. Gotthardt shared that there can be a wide interpretation of what does
140 “new types of housing” mean, and that this will get varied answers depending on how
141 respondents interpret the meaning. Ms. Stewart suggested clarifying future questions on housing
142 to specific zones in town. Mr. Kiley noted that he reads the data differently, he sees 24 ‘yes’ and
143 23 “no”. He stated that both “no” and “yes, but not in my neighborhood” both equal “no” in his
144 opinion. Co-Chair Fracht stated that he would plan to go through the data of the “other”
145 respondents, to see what they said. He stated that he did not particularly like the idea of
146 manipulating text answers into quantified data. There was further discussion from Mr. Durocher
147 and Ms. Stewart regarding data representation ideas, and ways data has been used in other
148 instances in town. Mr. Gotthardt suggested, if time allows, perhaps this question could be asked
149 at the Housing educational series tomorrow. Co-Chair Fracht disagreed that this was going
150 beyond the original scope of the question. There was further discussion on gathering and
151 interpreting the data for this question. Mr. Durocher asked what the proper venue would be to
152 further discuss this question? Mr. Kiley stated the November community workshop. Co-Chair
153 Fracht confirmed that the November 6 community workshop is the appropriate place to further
154 discuss this question and try to come up with definitions. Mr. Gotthardt added that he felt for that
155 November community workshop it would also be helpful to provide specifics (apartments in
156 downtown, multi-family apartment on Potato Rd, etc.).

157
158 Co-Chair Fracht explained the Question of the Week’s purpose. First, it would provide an
159 opportunity to be familiar with the software for polling. It was also an opportunity to make the
160 [Enfield-LEAPS](#) website more user friendly and interactive. Mr. Kiley stated it was to get
161 community involvement, which they want. Co-Chair Fracht recognized that this is a learning

curve, and that it is important to continue to refine wording and clarify questions as the process goes forward. Ms. Saxton will be very helpful with doing this going forward. Early questions from the Question of the Week were developed by MPTF sub-committee members, very early in the process.

Co-Chair Fracht asked for any further questions regarding the MPTF report. There were none.

IX. ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATES/CHANGES: Kurt Gotthardt

Chair Fracht moved forward to zoning ordinance changes. There is a sign ordinance change, and several others. He suggested reviewing the others first, as he felt the sign ordinance would require a lot of discussion.

Ms. Stewart reminded the board to be cognizant of where changes must fall legally on the warrant for Town Meeting, and to consider how many changes they make and why, as well as length of the changes.

Chair Fracht reminded the board that for the changes, two public hearings are required before they are submitted for the warrant article. Ms. Stewart asked for clarification on if the articles on the warrant would include the strikethrough of old language. Mr. Kiley and Mr. Taylor confirmed strikethrough would be used to show the changes.

401.1 R1 DISTRICT

401.2 R3 DISTRICT

401.3 R5 DISTRICT

Mr. Russell suggested including clarification of the definition of ‘street’ in the above areas.

There was discussion on the best way to word this. The board landed on “street per RSA: 674:41 giving access to the lot”. The idea would then be, if someone needs the definition for street, they look up the RSA. If the RSA ever changes, there is no update required to this document. Chair Fracht stated he would like to see a definition of the RSA: 674:41 to make it more user friendly. Mr. Russell stated that he would be inclined to look up the RSA, instead of finding the definition within the zoning ordinance. He did not feel adding the definition would be beneficial, but more confusing. Chair Fracht suggested that he is considering those who are not as computer literate. Ms. Stewart asked Mr. Taylor how many people are using a paper copy? Mr. Taylor responded not many. Ms. Stewart suggested, as did Mr. Kiley and Chair Fracht at the same time, that the RSA should be hyperlinked in the document. The board agreed this was important. Mr. Gotthardt added that the format of the zoning ordinances would need to be correct on the website in this case (currently the link is to the ‘paper’ version). The board agreed it is important to now add links to the document. Chair Fracht and Mr. Kiley confirmed that this change does not require a vote of the town, and the Planning Board may make the decision to update this.

401.4 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT (CB)

Chair Fracht suggested additional changes to the paragraph that states ‘no structure shall be located nearer than 30’ from any lot line contiguous to the street, or 20’ from any other lot boundary, or shall be higher than 35’ or two and a half stories.’ There was discussion about the state’s right of way, which is quite wide, as the CB district is along Rt 4. Mr. Taylor suggested in some cases this can actually be 80’. Mr. Russell circled back that he believes Chair Fracht’s question was – do we want to address this now, or in the future? Mr. Kiley suggested no further edits to this section as the ballot will already be quite lengthy. Mr. Gotthardt suggested perhaps it would be appropriate for the Master Plan Task Force. Chair Fracht agreed he was happy to defer to another time. Mr. Taylor added that there is some language about the average adjacent setbacks that could be incorporated into future edits. Ms. Jones asked, to clarify, if what we suggest for a change is 30’, is that from the lot line, or from where the state says the right of way ends? Mr. Gotthardt answered that it was the right of way.

APPENDIX A – LAND USE DEFINITIONS

Regarding the definition of frontage, Mr. Vermeer asked is there any consideration to corner lots? Mr. Gotthardt shared that he believed the RSA specifies for a corner lot the road that would be used for the 911 location, for the one giving access to the lot, would be used as frontage. Mr. Kiley suggested removing the word ‘line’ under the frontage definition as well. The board agreed. Mr. Gotthardt suggested the same change for the definition of street, which all agreed on.

401.4 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT (CB)

There is no lot width requirement. Chair Fracht suggested this be left alone until further input from the community for the Master Plan was gathered.

V. No further comments were made to this change.

401.5 COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (CI)

G. (formatting) - Mr. Taylor and Mr. Kiley noted that formatting does not require a public hearing, this could be done anytime.

H. Board members agreed this could be removed.

405.2 VILLAGE PLAN ALTERNATIVE

The board agreed with the suggestion to delete this as it is redundant of 405: OPEN SPACE/CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Gotthardt to forward the Word document changes to him. Mr. Gotthardt noted that he would need to review the minutes for the changes, and make edits, then would forward it to Mr. Taylor.

408 SIGNS

Mr. Taylor projected the proposed sign ordinance for all board members to review. Mr. Gotthardt shared that he reviewed towns similar in size to Enfield with ordinances to develop the language. He shared that some proposed language has multiple choice selections for the board to review and decide on which they prefer.

Chair Fracht asked what are we unhappy with about the current sign ordinance? Mr. Taylor shared that at the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) recently there was a request for variance regarding sign types. Mr. Taylor shared that the older “up light” type signs are not as good as the internally lit signs. His recommendation would be allowing internally lit signs, with the restriction for no flashing graphics, scrolling graphics, animated graphics. The recent variance request was for a sign that could change with latest sale info, as example. Mr. Taylor also brought up the LED gas price signs as an example which are currently not allowed (Jake’s was denied the ability to have one recently). Chair Fracht suggested breaking the signs into two categories: LED and internally lit. Mr. Taylor suggested all could be covered with language “internally lit, with color, without flashing, scrolling, and animated graphics”. Chair Fracht shared that he had reviewed Lebanon’s ordinance, which is specific to signage being less bright at night, etc. Chair Fracht shared that he would prefer a change in the ordinance to being black background, colored type, etc. Mr. Gotthardt shared considering the ideal vs. what an applicant might propose.

Mr. Russell suggested, it sounds like what we want is a static sign which may be changed once per day, or some specific, reasonable timeframe, and continued discussion on whether there need to be changes on the permissive light. Mr. Russell also suggested removing specific terminology like LED, etc.

Mr. Taylor shared that Lebanon had put together a committee to put together the ordinance. In Enfield, the change is to the zoning ordinance so it will have to go through Town Meeting.

Mr. Vermeer agreed with Mr. Russell that a minor change of signs to be internally lit, static, sign allowed to be changed once a day, - in addition to the current ordinance. Mr. Gotthardt shared that he felt that if the ordinance was not more specific it would cause problems.

Mr. Russell suggested as a next step, putting the current ordinance side-by-side with the proposed changes that clearly show what the board wishes to add. Chair Fracht suggested showing the changes with strikethrough, which Mr. Russell agreed would be helpful. The board agreed this would be beneficial. Mr. Gotthardt suggested additional concerns: location of signs, size of signs, etc.

Mr. Taylor suggested that if an entire new zoning ordinance is suggested as part of the new Master Plan, it will have many changes which could include further specific restrictions and details regarding signage. The board agreed that this was a good point.

Chair Fracht suggested that a minimal wording change (as Mr. Russell and Mr. Vermeer had agreed was useful earlier) would be most appropriate at this time. A larger change could happen in the future as part of the Master Plan. Chair Fracht offered to assist Mr. Gotthardt with the changes. Mr. Vermeer suggested that the Moultonborough Illumination language on Page 8 of the proposed changes document captured what the board was trying to add. Board members agreed. Mr. Gotthardt suggested, on Page 6, the maintenance and obsolesce section would be useful to review for suggested removal of old signs.

The board agreed on the following changes for this year for the sign ordinance: illumination and decommissioning of signs.

X. NEXT MEETING: October 27, 2021

XI. OTHER BUSINESS:

Chair Fracht asked for any further items to discuss. Mr. Gotthardt noted that he had difficulty watching the recording of the MPTF educational series from last week. He noted that there was discussion on having a service do recordings for the town, and one community member also offered to help though he did not know the man's name. Ms. Stewart clarified that this was Mr. Durocher who was present at this meeting earlier today. She also noted she was taking further action on moving this forward.

Chair Fracht proposed a resolution:

Be it resolved that the Enfield Planning Board has been using Zoom and other video playback successfully for some period. We have found increased public participation and awareness of our activities, and we strongly recommend that the Town of Enfield institute and on-demand video playback for all board and committee meetings.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Gotthardt to adopt the resolution as presented.

The MOTION was seconded by Mr. Vermeer.

Roll Call Vote:

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Erik Russell, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard representative, via Zoom platform), Phil Vermeer **all voting Yea.**

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

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

Ms. Stewart requested that we forward the resolution with approval count directly to the Town Manager and Chair of the Selectboard. Mr. Taylor will forward this as a memo to the Town Manager and the Selectboard.

Chair Fracht noted that he would like to speak with Mr. Gotthardt after the meeting regarding specific video issues.

Mr. Taylor shared he will be going to Burlington tomorrow, Thursday, and Friday to the [Northern New England Chapter of the American Planning Association \(NNECAPA\)](#) annual planner's conference. One session he plans to attend is implementation of a Master Plan, in addition to others. Mr. Taylor will give a report of this session and the meeting at the next meeting.

Chair Fracht asked Mr. Taylor to confirm if the board needs to review the sign ordinance at the next meeting. Mr. Taylor stated he believed the deadline for getting it on the warrant had a December/January deadline, so there is still time to review it.

Mr. Taylor asked the board – do we want to meet the Wednesday before Thanksgiving? Normally the second meeting in November falls on this day. The board agreed they would not meet that day.

Ms. Stewart made a request that as we hit the time change and colder months, driving can be challenging. She asked for longer meetings, could the board start earlier? Chair Fracht asked, can we legally start earlier? Mr. Taylor confirmed that we can. Chair Fracht suggested starting at 6:30. The board chose not to decide tonight. Chair Fracht suggested controlling length of meetings by not scheduling too many hearings together, if possible. Mr. Taylor agreed this was an option. Ms. Stewart suggested putting those who are from further away earlier in the meeting, if possible, Chair Fracht agreed.

XII. ADJOURNMENT:

*A MOTION was made by Mr. Kiley to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m.
The MOTION was seconded by Mr. Vermeer.*

Roll Call Vote:

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Erik Russell, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard representative, via Zoom platform), Phil Vermeer **all voting Yea.**

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

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

Enfield Planning Board Minutes, October 13, 2021

367 Respectfully submitted,
368 Whitney Banker
369 Recording Secretary