

Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes
DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/MICROSOFT TEAMS
PLATFORM
March 23, 2022

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative, via Microsoft Teams Platform), Phil Vermeer, Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer)

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Erik Russell (Vice Chair)

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

GUESTS: Dawnlynn Marston & Melanie Marston & Donald Marston (via Microsoft Teams Platform), Gwyn Dessert (via Microsoft Teams Platform), David Rogers & Victoria Rogers, Nik Fiore, Bruce Bergeron, Ryan Bergeron, *note – another member of the public attended the meeting in person, however she did not sign in and did not speak during the meeting on any discussions.*

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.

Chair Fracht elevated Mr. Bonner to a voting member tonight, as Mr. Russell is unable to attend.

Chair Fracht reminded audience members to sign in if they had not already done so.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Chair Fracht asked for public comments for anything not on the agenda. There were none.

III. SELECTBOARD REPORT: Kate Plumley Stewart

Ms. Stewart shared the Selectboard met briefly for their last meeting. Most recent meetings have been shorter.

There was an update from the Town Manager Ed Morris regarding the proposed building projects. Mr. Morris shared a video slideshow of the deficiencies of each building. The slideshow is available with the meeting on the [Town of Enfield YouTube](#) page. Ms. Stewart encouraged all to watch it.

IV. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: February 23, 2022

Mr. Kiley *MOVED* to approve the February 23, 2022, Minutes presented in the March 23, 2022, agenda packet as presented and amended.

Seconded by Mr. Vermeer

Amendments:

Line 50: remove apostrophe from “agenda’s”

Line 136: town of franklin “who” to “which”

Line 17: “Eckhert” to “Eckert”

Line 32: “?” to “.”

Line 202: “building sin” to “buildings in”

Roll Call Vote:

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative, via Microsoft Teams Platform), Phil Vermeer **all voting Yea.**

None voted Nay.

Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer) **Abstained.**

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

V. HEARINGS:

Enfield Land Use Case # P22-03-01, BMB Real Estate LLC will seek Major Site Plan Review Approval for a car wash and self-storage business. The subject property is located at 223 US Route 4 (Tax Map 33, Lot 5) and is owned by BMB Real Estate LLC. This parcel is partially within both the “CB” Zoning District and the “R1” District. BMB Real Estate LLC was granted variance relief in December of 2021 by the Enfield ZBA to operate the self-storage business on the R1 portion of the property. Engineering Ventures, PC of Burlington, VT and Lebanon, NH is representing the applicant in this case.

Chair Fracht read the case. He explained the procedure: this is a public hearing. Chair Fracht will open the hearing and give applicants as much time as they need to present their plans. There will then be questions from the Planning Board. Once the board has finished, the public will be able to ask questions. Once everyone has had an opportunity to ask questions and speak their mind, the hearing will be closed. At that time, the Planning Board will discuss pros and cons of the proposal.

Chair Fracht opened the public hearing. He asked representatives to introduce themselves. There were Mr. Bruce Bergeron, Mr. Ryan Bergeron, and Mr. Nick Fiore with Engineering Ventures.

Mr. B. Bergeron explained the details of the proposed plan that he had provided in the application packer. Mr. Fiore Reviewed the drawing set and touched on the highlights. The cover page shows a rendering of what the building will look like, as well as the proposed location. On page 3, C1.1 is the existing plan that shows Brownies auto parts store as it currently stands. He

85 explained the section of the section of the property that is currently an open field. He explained
86 that wetlands and the town's 50' buffer from them are considered. On C2.1, he reviewed the
87 access point for the proposed plan. He explained that the site is designed to accommodate
88 appropriate stormwater runoff per DOT. He outlined the vacuum spaces, as well as the proposed
89 car wash building with a mechanical bay in between. Customers would drive in from Route 4,
90 drive around the back to enter the wash, and exit out Route 4. He explained there is a connecting
91 driveway through to the self-storage that will be gated – this is for the use of Mr. B. Bergeron
92 and his crew – such as for snow removal. Mr. Fiore then explained the four proposed self-storage
93 buildings. There will be 20'-24' between each building, and each building is 30' wide with
94 lengths varied between 140'-150' (some are 10' smaller than originally planned due to the
95 wetlands setback). The driveway for the self-storage units is off Flanders Street. This will be
96 gated, with an open gate during business hours, and keypad-only access for self-storage
97 customers.

98
99 Mr. Fiore Next reviewed the utility plan. Currently the Brownies building sewer goes across the
100 lot to Flanders Street. They plan to re-route this to Route 4. There will be a new water line into
101 the building as well. He explained some underground stormwater fore-bays shown on the plan.
102 They are designed to trap heavy solid contaminants.

103
104 Mr. Fiore Next reviewed C2.5 to show proposed landscaping. On the north side there will be
105 rows of evergreen trees to act as a screen for the neighbor to the north. On the south side, there
106 will be another row of trees. He noted there is already some screening in this location. He
107 pointed out some snow-storage areas designated as well.

108
109 Mr. Fiore Next reviewed C3.0, the stormwater plan showing some of the stormwater piping.
110 There are underdrains that will help take care of keeping the pavement in a more stable condition
111 throughout the year. They are not in conflict with any utilities, etc. The following pages included
112 constructions details. The second-to-last page included the lighting plan. Mr. Fiore Said each
113 building will have 3 lights on it to cast between buildings, and there are perimeter lights as well.
114 At the carwash site, there is sight-lighting along the western edge as well as the building itself.
115 He reviewed the last page that shows elevation views of the car wash building itself to provide
116 an idea of what the building will look like.

117
118 Chair Fracht asked for questions from board members. Mr. Vermeer stated that the GIS map
119 present location was on the wrong side. Mr. Fiore Made note to adjust this. Mr. Vermeer said
120 that the southern exposure was very good in this location and asked if they planned to put solar
121 panels on the storage units. Mr. B. Bergeron said they had not considered it, but they will
122 investigate it. Mr. Vermeer suggested while doing construction conduit could be put it for future
123 panels if they didn't wish to do it right now. He said he has a feeling with the amount of space
124 there the panels could potentially cover all the electricity cost for the proposed car wash. Mr. B.
125 Bergeron asked if they work on a 1-12" relatively flat area? Mr. Vermeer said they do, there can
126 be some troubles in the winter – the Public Works sand shed is an example of this. He explained
127 the credits during the summer months. Chair Fracht asked if Mr. Vermeer knew the nearest
128 three-phase power to the proposed car wash location. Mr. Vermeer said he believed it was right
129 in that area of the proposed car wash. Mr. B. Bergeron and Mr. Fiore Said they would do more
130 research on this possibility.

131
132 Mr. Gotthardt asked, for C1.1 he believed there was a typo with “see note 3” which he believed
133 should be “see note 4”. Mr. Fiore Corrected the error. On page C2.1, Mr. Gotthardt pointed out
134 the main proposed layout and said he was confused on the Flanders Street side what the true
135 property line is. Mr. Fiore Said their understanding was that he believed it was the one closer to
136 the road – this is where the pins are. Mr. Gotthardt said on the actual plan where the car wash is
137 proposed, my concern is during the busy months of the year you have the potential for cars
138 queueing up almost onto Route 4. He noted the Lebanon Jake’s car wash location as an example.
139 He said he did not know how they would prevent a car from trying to get in, but suggested hash-
140 marks for no-parking (like a fire lane) that this might help. The visual may help show customers
141 not to sit there. Mr. Fiore Said this was a good idea. Mr. R. Bergeron said they had mapped out
142 the number of proposed cars. Mr. Fiore Said he was between 18-20 cars that appear they will fit
143 in the area. Mr. Gotthardt asked if they planned to mark the one-way directional. Mr. Fiore Said
144 they had not planned on it; they did not believe it would be effective with the low volume. Mr.
145 Gotthardt said with the 20’ spacing, there must be room for cars not to be stuck in the middle, or
146 to go the other way, etc.? Mr. B. Bergeron said if someone is in the way, another car can go
147 around it within the 20’ spacing. Mr. R. Bergeron said their experience in Lebanon has been that
148 customers tend to figure it out themselves. Mr. Gotthardt said his other concern was regarding
149 the lighting plan. For the Route 4 entrance, there is some spillover from the property onto Route
150 4 according to the maps. Mr. B. Bergeron asked if the lighting must end at the property line?
151 Chair Fracht and Mr. Kiley agreed it does have to end at the property line. Mr. Gotthardt said
152 that there is additional spillover onto Flanders Street. Mr. Fiore Said they can switch out the
153 fixture head to contain this. Mr. B. Bergeron said that perimeter building will also be shut off
154 after business hours (lighting on buildings for safety reasons will remain).

155
156 Ms. Jones said that she sees they have a rain retention basin planned. Mr. Fiore Said they do. Ms.
157 Jones asked if there was any plan to have an area for the Advanced Transit bus to pull off the
158 roadway to stop. Mr. Fiore Said they are not touching the current, wide area that the AT bus is
159 using. The area will be next to the storm drain hole.

160
161 Mr. Kiley asked if they plan to route car wash traffic through the self-storage area. Mr. B.
162 Bergeron said he don’t plan to but are able to if they need to. Chair Fracht asked if they would
163 have someone available to open the gate to accommodate this if necessary? Mr. B. Bergeron said
164 they would not have someone immediately available but could have someone go there if needed.
165 Mr. Gotthardt asked if when they went through the ZBA, was there a stipulation for keeping the
166 gate closed? Mr. B. Bergeron clarified that the stipulation was that in the R1 zone area (proposed
167 for the storage units) there would be no car wash traffic – only self-storage traffic.

168
169 Ms. Stewart did not have any questions or comments.

170
171 Chair Fracht said on C2-1, as he looks at the print there does not appear to be a fence on the
172 north side of the storage units. He asked if this was on purpose. Mr. B. Bergeron said the fence
173 was intended to be 3+ sides, with the west side (against the hill) not having a fence. Mr. Fiore
174 Said this was not what was depicted. Mr. B. Bergeron clarified the fence would go along
175 Flanders Street. It would go from along the north side, down the east side (Flanders Street), and a
176 small distance south then open to the wooded area. Chair Fracht asked for clarification of the

177 propane tanks. On one sheet, there is a tank drawn on another an indication for a tank with no
178 tank shown, and on the detail sheet C4.4 note 5 indicates there are three tanks. Mr. Fiore Said the
179 three-tank note is incorrect – it is just a carryover explanation if there were multiple tanks. There
180 are not multiple tanks. It would be a single tank. Some sheets show a tank, and some don't
181 because some show underground utilities and some don't. Chair Fracht said to follow-up on the
182 lighting, will all the wall lighting be on in the storage area overnight, or will some be motion-
183 activated. Mr. B. Bergeron said they had not thought about motion-sensing lights. Chair Fracht
184 said he assumed these lights would be enough for customers to load and unload. Mr. B. Bergeron
185 said it is low lighting but would be enough to do that.

186
187 Mr. Taylor said he had consulted with staff and shared comments from them. Public Works had
188 similar concerns to Mr. Gotthardt and Chair Fracht regarding queueing issues with customers
189 into the street. He said the Police Chief had the same concern. If needed the gate can be opened
190 as previously discussed. Another concern from Public Works was having a key to do water
191 shutoff in an emergency. Mr. B. Bergeron agreed this made sense. Public Works is also
192 requesting a new driveway permit from Flanders Street for the change of use. The Fire Chief
193 asked for KnoxBox access for the Fire Department to get into the buildings. He also requested
194 KnoxBox padlocks on the gates for Fire Department access. Ms. Jones asked what a KnoxBox
195 is. Mr. Taylor explained it is a standard type of box that Fire Departments have key access to, to
196 be able to get into a box of keys and access the property in the event of a fire or emergency. Mr.
197 Taylor said the Building Inspector will work with them on the permit, so he will discuss any
198 concerns with them directly.

199
200 Mr. Gotthardt said on Route 4, the area that the town owns per the deed – he would not be
201 surprised if the town is unaware of this. He suggested sharing the information with Mr. Taylor
202 who could share with the town. He said perhaps a designated bus stop could be located there.
203 Mr. Taylor said that the Public Works director is also a board member for Advanced Transit.

204
205 Mr. Bonner had no comments or questions.

206
207 Chair Fracht said on the front page there is an indication for a sign on the building itself. He
208 asked if there would be any other signage. Mr. B. Bergeron said the plan is to utilize the current
209 road signage Brownies uses at this time. Chair Fracht asked if there was any planned on Flanders
210 Street. Mr. B. Bergeron said he does not envision anything large, perhaps some signage at the
211 keypad. He will have to revisit.

212
213 Ms. Stewart asked what the noise impact on neighbors would be. Mr. B. Bergeron said when a
214 car is entering the noise cannot be contained, but when a car is inside the building their
215 preference is to keep both doors closed to help contain the noise. Ms. Stewart said that
216 community members do tend to refer to the noise ordinance with issues. Chair Fracht suggested
217 Mr. B. Bergeron obtain a spec from the car wash supplier regarding DB standards. Mr. Kiley and
218 Mr. Gotthardt said with the one in Lebanon they didn't notice any noise other than the air faintly
219 from outside when waiting in line. Mr. Vermeer said he believes noise from trucks going through
220 would be more disruptive.

221

Mr. Gotthardt asked how close they planned to keep the building aesthetic to the drawing. Mr. Bergeron said they took some elements from the Jake's store in town and were hopeful to keep the look of the building as close as possible to the proposal despite increased construction costs.

Ms. Marston said they are in the property across the road. She explained that drainage from the site flows under the street onto their yard and causes issues with their lawn. She asked with paving where will the drainage go? Mr. Fiore Said between Flanders Street and the driveway for the storage units, they plan to deepen the ditches and add routing that will move water around the storage units and toward Route 4. He said for larger storms there should not be an increase in the amount of water that flows under the road across the property. Ms. Marston asked if there is anything that can be done further to get the water to move toward Route 4. Mr. Marston said the problem seems to have increased in recent years versus when they bought the property in 2014/2015. Mr. Fiore Said his guess would be that there could be road debris filling up the culvert over the years. He said their plan is to create water storage on their side of the road. He expects water from only large storms to go across the street, but not regularly. Mr. Vermeer said he had spoken with the Road Agent about the resurfacing of Flanders Street planned for this summer and they mentioned they are aware of the water problems. Ms. Stewart said she agreed that the Department of Public Works (DPW) is the proper source to help with this situation. She provided contact information. Ms. Marston said she had tried contacting the DPW but has been unsuccessful. Ms. Stewart said if they are not getting a response, to contact the Town Manager, Ed Morris. She said she agreed it was very important to resolve. Ms. Stewart provided the Town Manger contact email as well as her own and mentioned she could be CC'd on the message. Ms. Stewart mentioned, in reference to the routing of stormwater into the sewer, that Enfield is trying to keep it separate. Mr. Gotthardt said that town regulations to require that there be no increase in runoff to a development site, so the situation with water runoff cannot get worse. Mr. Fiore Said it is a decrease.

Chair Fracht asked for any further questions or comments. Mr. Marston asked regarding the water leaving the property, can they separate it out? Mr. B. Bergeron said the stormwater that goes into Route 4 goes under Route 4, and into the river.

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

Chair Fracht asked board members for further questions or comments among themselves. He asked if they wished to make any conditions. Mr. Kiley said the conditions of the state and town driveway permits, as well as the changes Mr. Gotthardt noted for lighting to conform to town lighting regulations. Ms. Jones said it was not a condition, but they would appreciate any efforts made to make the facilities attractive and to fit in with the town. Mr. Gotthard suggested the condition for some form of mocking or signage for no queueing spilling onto Route 4. Ms. Stewart suggested the KnoxBox as another condition.

Chair Fracht read the six conditions discussed and asked if there were any others. There were no other conditions suggested by board members.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Kiley to approve the Jakes Car Wash and Self-Storage plan at 223 US Route 4, Tax Map 33, Lot 5, Enfield Land Use Case #P22-03-01 with the following conditions:

- Obtain state and town driveway permits**
- KnoxBox to be on the building doors and gates**
- Department of Public Works and Fire Department access to water shutoff**
- Lighting to conform to town regulations**
- Markings on the pavement and/or signage that indicate no queueing on Route 4**
- Pending final approval of signs**

The MOTION was seconded by Mr. Vermeer

Roll Call Vote:

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Phil Vermeer, Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer)

all voting Yea.

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

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

Chair Fracht asked when they planned to begin construction. Mr. B. Bergeron said the plan is to begin work this summer into the fall.

VI. CONCEPTUALS:

David and Victoria Rogers- 8 Brown Street and 1443 NH Route 4A Subdivisions

1443 Route 4A Subdivision, Tax Map 9, Lot 36:

Chair Fracht invited Mr. and Ms. Rogers to present their first plan.

Mr. Rogers referred to the larger map to begin with. He said he had previously come to the board to give 4.01-acres to his daughter, who plans to begin construction in May. He said he would like to give a similar-sized lot to his son to build a house. He had outlined the proposed area in yellow. He said he is thinking the driveway would be along the left side of the property. Ms. Rogers clarified that it would be a joint driveway that they also use. Ms. Jones asked for clarification all the way to the left? Mr. Rogers said yes. He had found out the driveway location and home location would be determined more by the State of New Hampshire Wetlands Bureau. Mr. Rogers said there is currently a paved driveway from Route 4A. He plans to remove this driveway and move access to his home to the joint driveway. Ms. Jones said it was difficult for them to understand the locations he was discussing. Mr. Gotthardt agreed. Mr. Rogers clipped the map to the white board so members could understand the proposal.

Mr. Rogers explained his total parcel, the 4.01-acres he had given to his daughter, and the proposed acres to go to his son, as well as his current home location and the proposed shared driveway.

Chair Fracht asked what is the other driveway to the east? Mr. Rogers and Ms. Rogers said this was the approve driveway for the daughter's 4.01-acre lot. Mr. Rogers explained two other locations he considered for the driveway, that had issues with wetlands and elevations.

Mr. Taylor clarified that the property was partially in R1 and partially in R5. Mr. Rogers clarified that the surveyor labeled the back part of the lot R3, but he believes it is R5. Mr. Taylor agreed.

Mr. Taylor asked if the board was satisfied with the proposed frontage? Mr. Kiley and Mr. Vermeer agreed it appeared to have the correct frontage.

Ms. Stewart said it was difficult to hear the conversations with multiple going on.

Mr. Gotthardt said his concern would be zoning for the town frontage required, and that the state will then say where the driveway can go. Ms. Rogers said the state had already approved the one driveway for the daughter's section, and that they plan to use the existing driveway for both their property and the proposed property going to their son. Mr. Rogers said not exactly, he thought they would have to get a new approval. Mr. Gotthardt said any time there is a change in the use of a state or town road, they would need a new permit. Ms. Jones asked if the road frontage must be contiguous. Chair Fracht and Mr. Kiley said no. Ms. Stewart said she was reviewing the GIS map and the total frontage seems quite large, even though they split off a section already. Mr. Gotthardt clarified they need 75 contiguous feet. Ms. Stewart said they have more than this, so it should not be a problem. Chair Fracht said the only possible thing he could see would be the state saying that the proposed new driveway is too close to the driveway for the 4.01-acre lot. Mr. and Ms. Rogers agreed they understood that this could be up in the air. Chair Fracht suggested they get the permit before coming back to the Planning Board.

Mr. Taylor said the other thing he would add is that it is a second subdivision in less than 2 years, so instead of a minor subdivision it is considered a major subdivision. This raises the fee from \$250 to \$500. Mr. Kiley said there aren't other changes, the board could waive the other items. He explained it prevents someone from coming back, as example, every six months and making small subdivisions for the lesser fee. Chair Fracht read the regulations for a major and minor subdivision from the town zoning ordinance:

Subdivision, Major: Subdivision, Major: Shall mean the division of a lot, tract, or parcel of land into three (3) or more lots, sites, tracts, or other divisions of land.

Subdivision, Minor: Subdivision, Minor: Shall mean the division of a lot, tract, or parcel of land into two (2) lots, sites, or other dwelling units, and which requires no new roads, public utilities, or other municipal improvements. A parcel of land which has been subjected to minor subdivision shall not be eligible for further minor subdivision for a period of five (5) years from the date of the most recent minor subdivision approval.

Chair Fracht explained they could either wait for the 5-year time to pass or understand the fees would increase. He said he thinks the board would waive many of the lesser requirements for major subdivision since it is relatively minor in this case.

8 Brown Street, Tax Map 38, Lot 45:

Mr. Rogers moved on to the second conceptual. The property is on Brown Street, a town road, which is off May Street. Mr. Rogers said that looking at the map, Brown Street goes all the way to the end of the property shown – however, he believes the end of the road is owned by the individual next door to his property. He explained there is an existing home at the location, near the street and close to Lot 46 on the map.

Mr. Rogers said that for lot 45 on Brown Street, they were considering putting a modular home in this location. He explained they were thinking of dividing their lot in half. Mr. Rogers explained the current lot on the map Mr. Taylor projected. Mr. Rogers explained the proposed location of a driveway if they split the lot, to make two equal lots. Ms. Jones and Chair Fracht asked if town water and sewer were available there. Mr. Rogers said it is. Chair Fracht said the minimum requirement is a half-acre per lot which this would be within. A driveway permit would be required from the town. Mr. Taylor asked does he have the frontage that he needs? Mr. Rogers said he has called for a surveyor but has not been able to have one done yet. He believes it will be about 200' across the lot, but the 105' is not town road. Chair Fracht said this would be an issue. Ms. Jones said 75' per lot would be the requirement. Mr. Gotthardt said the tax map measurements could be incorrect as well. Mr. Taylor asked about a potential duplex at the current location, which is an option in the R1 district. Ms. Jones asked is the road paved to the end? Mr. Rogers said it was, and that the town maintains it, but he is under the impression the end section is owned by the neighboring lot. Mr. Gotthardt said a surveyor may find differently depending on the records from when the road was built. Ms. Jones and Mr. Kiley agreed a survey is an important step first. Mr. Rogers agreed that it is currently unclear how much of the road the town owns.

Ms. Stewart said she was reviewing the deed, which says 140' of frontage – this may be incorrect, but it would not be enough. Mr. Taylor said he could turn the existing home into a duplex with the amount of land. He read the town zoning ordinance:

A. One-family, two-family and multi-family dwellings, and manufactured homes on individual lots.

and

391 K. Minimum lot size shall be one (1) acre except for dwellings, in which minimum lot
392 size shall be one (1) acre per dwelling unit with on-lot water and sewer supply but may
393 be one-half acre lot size for a dwelling where municipal water and sewer are used.
394

395 Mr. Taylor said they could build onto the existing house, or they could also put in a two-family
396 modular if they wished. They could also do a modular that is within the size restrictions of an
397 ADU.
398

399 Mr. Rogers asked would he be able to get permits to build another home on the property, while
400 living in the current home until the new property is done and the current home can be torn down.
401 Mr. Gotthardt and Mr. Kiley agreed this would be a building inspector question. Mr. Taylor
402 suggested Mr. Rogers contact the building inspector tomorrow to discuss. Ms. Stewart said there
403 was an example of this on Gardener Lane, but she believed they tore down the old house first.
404 Mr. Kiley as an abutter said that they did tear down the old house first. Mr. Taylor suggested Mr.
405 Rogers could call him or stop by the office tomorrow as well, to discuss with both the building
406 inspector and public works.
407

408 Mr. and Ms. Rogers thanked the board for their advice.
409

410 **VII. UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING TASK FORCE WORK: David Fracht**

411 Co-Chair Fracht shared the Master Planning Task Force is conducting focus groups this week.
412 The groups are lasting about 1.5-2 hours each. Each focus group is for a chapter of the Master
413 Plan. First drafts of all chapters have been received including the Visioning chapter. Co-Chair
414 Fracht had been able to attend two of the focus groups and felt they had received good feedback.
415 Many of the positives agreed that they chapters touched on all the important things. He said
416 many of the focus groups had feedback on wording and meaning attached to. Mr. Taylor said he
417 had attended the Transportation chapter focus group last night, that included Mr. Jennings the
418 former Director of Public Works who provided some great historical insight and feedback. He
419 provided some explanation of challenges that come with sidewalks, etc. Other discussions
420 included limitations of our roads for multi-modes of transportation. He said Co-Chair Smith was
421 also there to share an accident where she was hit on her bike. He said he enjoyed the small-
422 format groups and felt they were productive. Some feedback was given to some of the
423 photographs, typos, etc.
424

425 Co-Chair Fracht said the MPTF will review the focus group feedback at their meeting next
426 Monday. Ms. Saxton will incorporate those changes. Co-Chair Fracht said he hopes to have a
427 draft to bring to the Planning Board for the month of April. The plan is then to have it reviewed
428 by the Selectboard. In late April or early May, they then hope to have a public gathering with as
429 many community members as possible to provide feedback. After this, another round of edits
430 will come. If changes are significant, the process of review by Planning Board, Selectboard, and
431 public may be repeated. The following stage will be for the Planning Board to approve or reject

the most edited version. Co-Chair Fracht said he hopes that by that time they will have gotten as much feedback as possible from community members.

The next four chapters planned are Energy, Heritage, Recreation, and possibly Town Facilities. Those chapters all have committees that have been actively working for some period. The MPTF would plan to meet with those committees, take input from them, and adjust.

Co-Chair Fracht shared he felt they are well on their way to having a town plan.

Ms. Stewart shared that she was unable to attend the session on Monday but found review of the chapter very difficult with the number of grammatical errors. She suggested the chapters be reviewed for these errors prior to going forward to community members again. Ms. Stewart said she felt Ms. Saxton should review and correct these errors initially before future rounds of review. Co-Chair Fracht agreed this was a reasonable request.

Ms. Stewart also mentioned themes that should be carried across multiple chapters. She had only reviewed a single chapter but suggested having the themes outlined so they can be tracked to ensure they are going throughout all chapters. Co-Chair Fracht said he was unsure if they were currently down on paper, but he would investigate it.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS:

Chair Fracht circled back to the Village Plan Alternative issue previously discussed. He said as the board probably knows, all the zoning amendments were passed. The Village Plan change was the only amendment that had a very close vote and passed by only about 20 votes.

Chair Fracht said he wished to bring the board up to speed on what he found on the ordinance. He found the town adopted the section of the RSA word-for-word as the ordinance. The state RSA is not a model ordinance, but an enabling ordinance that gives the town the right to make an ordinance for different types of alternative, land-conserving development schemes. Chair Fracht said there are 14 of them total, of which up until Town Meeting, Enfield had 3 of in place: Village Plan Alternative, Cluster Development, and Impact Fees. He said the part of the state statute that is not incorporated into the town ordinance is that specific standards can be placed with the ordinance. Chair Fracht said he felt without the specific standards, he felt the ordinance was unenforceable. Chair Fracht said he had also found Village Plan Alternative purpose and considerations from the state of NH. He said after reading this, he felt he had a better understanding of the issues with the ordinance as it had been written.

Chair Fracht suggested the board reach out to Dr. Theis, Mr. Jennings, and Mr. Mirski (even though he is not currently a town resident) to explain that history. He has drafted a letter to them for the board to review. Mr. Taylor projected the draft on screen and emailed a copy to Ms. Stewart to review.

Board members agreed they liked the proposed draft. Ms. Stewart said she had minor edits she would email over. Mr. Gotthardt said he would not use the term Village Plan Alternative, being that the town voted to get rid of it this may confuse people. He suggested the board write a cluster development ordinance and try to get this approved and have the current one deleted. Chair Fracht said for the purposes of this letter, he thinks they must use Village plan Alternative as that is what is referred to in the statute. For future discussion, he said he thinks any appropriate term could be used. Chair Fracht said he did not believe Enfield would have enough land to implement the Village Plan Alternative as it is outlined. He said this is something that could be discussed down the road. Ms. Stewart agreed this is the different between being aspirational and being able to build and enforce it.

Chair Fracht suggested a motion or resolution. Ms. Stewart said she had emailed her edits to Mr. Taylor. Mr. Taylor projected the edited version. Mr. Gotthardt suggested reviewing edits and discussing at the next meeting. Chair Fracht agreed, they would incorporate Ms. Stewarts edits and each review separately. If there were no further edits or significant changes, Chair Fracht would send the letter. If they were significant changes, they could review at the next meeting. Ms. Jones agreed she would like a change to review separately.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Gotthardt that the letter be amended and presented to board members for approval via email this week. Edits will be sent to Mr. Taylor. The letter will be sent once Mr. Taylor received confirmation from all board members that there are not further changes.

The MOTION was seconded by Ms. Jones

Roll Call Vote:

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Phil Vermeer, Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer)

all voting Yea.

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

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

Mr. Kiley said he would like to be reappointed to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) as the Planning Board rep for another year.

A MOTION was made by Ms. Stewart to appoint Mr. Kiley to the CIP as Planning Board representative for another year.

The MOTION was seconded by Chair Fracht.

515 **Roll Call Vote:**

516 David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart
517 (Selectboard Representative), Phil Vermeer, Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer)

518 **all voting Yea.**

519 **None voted Nay.**

520 **None Abstained.**

521

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

523

524 **IX. NEW BUSINESS:**

525 None.

526

527 **X. NEXT MEETING:** April 13, 2022

528

529 **XI. ADJOURNMENT:**

530

531 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Kiley to adjourn the meeting at 9:04 p.m.*

532 *The MOTION was seconded by Mr. Vermeer*

533

534 **Roll Call Vote:**

535 David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart
536 (Selectboard Representative), Phil Vermeer, Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer)

537 **all voting Yea.**

538 **None voted Nay.**

539 **None Abstained.**

540

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

542

543 Respectfully submitted,

544 Whitney Banker

545 Recording Secretary