

Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes
DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/MICROSOFT TEAMS
PLATFORM
April 13, 2022

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones (via Microsoft Teams Platform), Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), 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, Ed Morris (Town Manager)

STAFF ABSENT: Whitney Banker-Recording Secretary

GUESTS: Nicole Sipe

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 for tonight as Mr. Russell is absent.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

III. SELECTBOARD REPORT: Kate Plumley Stewart

Ms. Stewart said the Selectboard met April 4.

There were two public hearings in succession on bonds or notes over \$15,000. One was Whitney Hall Renovation and Expansion, and one was the Public Safety facility. There were a lot of great questions. Ms. Stewart said if anyone did not have a chance to see this meeting, she recommended viewing the recording on the [Town of Enfield YouTube channel](#).

The Selectboard had a presentation from the firefighters, and there will continue to be presentations like this when they complete a certification level.

There were some grants discussed. There was a grant for water funding that will cover 40% of the cost.

The Selectboard looked at several policies and made revisions that were voted on and passed.

IV. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: March 23, 2022

Chair Fracht said the minute review would be tabled until the next meeting as Ms. Banker is not in attendance to make changes.

V. DISCUSSION WITH THE TOWN MANAGER: ED MORRIS

Chair Fracht said at the previous meeting he had brought up the possibility of drafting a response to community members who had opposed Warrant Article 4 (removing the Village Plan Alternative). The draft was reviewed by all board members who agreed with it. Mr. Morris brought up some reasonable points in terms of the delayed timing of the letter; based on that discussion the letter was not sent.

Chair Fracht invited Mr. Morris to come to the board tonight to discuss further. If the board wishes to send the letter after tonight's discussion with Mr. Morris, they may do so. Chair Fracht turned over the discussion to Mr. Morris.

Mr. Morris said he had reviewed the draft letter and thought a few days about the response. Prior to the vote, Mr. Morris and Chair Fracht had discussed the possibility of sending a letter to the three community members who were most opposed to Article 4 and creating a lot of discussion about it. Mr. Morris said he felt that with the time lag, sending a response now might cause further upset than be helpful. Mr. Morris said it is ultimately the decision of the Planning Board to send the letter if they wish; he felt it would cause more trouble than it would help. Chair Fracht said that he agreed with Mr. Morris that the best timing to send the letter had been missed.

Chair Fracht asked board members for their thoughts. Ms. Stewart said she agreed the timing lag was a good point. She said that she felt having the discussion as a board was still a beneficial conversation, but at this point she is in favor of not sending a letter. Mr. Kiley said he agreed that he did not see the need for sending the letter. Mr. Vermeer agreed the time had passed, there was no sense in sending the letter. Mr. Gotthardt agreed the discussion would have been best prior to the town vote and agreed with Mr. Kiley there is no need to send the letter. Mr. Bonner agreed the time has passed to take any action on this letter. Ms. Jones agreed the discussion and research was very good and should be kept for any future need to address this, but no need to send a response at this time.

Chair Fracht agreed he would save the draft of the letter for future use if/when needed. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Morris also have copies of the draft. Chair Fracht thanked Mr. Morris for attending and discussing this.

VI. HEARINGS:

None

VII. CONCEPTUALS**Nicole Sipe Bog Road Equestrian Site and Gravel Pit Reclamation**

Chair Fracht invited Ms. Sipe to come to the table for her presentation. He asked board members if they recalled meeting Ms. Sipe last summer, board members agreed they did.

Ms. Sipe asked to request a written document for her records with details of what needs to be done for the reclamation plan, by what dates, and that it will be passed by the Planning Board.

Ms. Sipe said that she also has the site plan review for the commercial equestrian operation. She said that because this is a major site plan review, she believes it is possible to request waivers, and has a question about waiving the full engineered map. She said that she feels she can get all information required into a detailed site sketch and does not feel the full engineered map is necessary. She asked to have the Planning Board review this request for their opinion.

Chair Fracht said she is correct; it is a major site plan. He asked Ms. Sipe to clarify, she would like to ask for waiver of the engineers site plan drawing but she would include all the information on a reasonably-to-scale sketch. Ms. Sipe confirmed this is correct. Chair Fracht asked how many acres are involved? Ms. Sipe said about 15 cleared and there would be about 2 or 3 of that (there are two buildings, a barn and a shed going up). Chair Fracht asked if there were any issues with water or drainage. Ms. Sipe said there did not seem to be, and there would be a lot of regrading that would happen with the reclamation plan.

Mr. Gotthardt asked what is the total possible acreage? Ms. Sipe said she believed there is about 20 cleared (14 originally, and she has cleared about 5 additional acres). A lot of this will be pasture. Ms. Sipe said that the whole lot is 90-acres. Mr. Gotthardt said that without a checklist of waiver requests, it is hard to know how they board will decide. Mr. Taylor projected the property card on screen for board members to review. Mr. Kiley said that he agreed with Mr. Gotthardt. The biggest thing will be the reclamation plan. Mr. Taylor offered to make copies of the plan for board members. Ms. Sipe said that there would be 1 barn and 1 three-sided shed on a flat site, away from wetlands; there would not be anything she felt needed the full engineered map.

Ms. Stewart said she had no issues with the reclamation plan. Ms. Jones agreed it sounded good to her. Chair Fracht said that they would be looking at what Ms. Sipe would ask for waivers on, but he felt she could assume from tonight's comments that she would be likely to receive most if not all the waivers she would plan to ask for.

Chair Fracht said he felt it would be counter-productive of the board to require a full engineering study of something that would be in its natural state after it is reclaimed. He told Ms. Sipe she should put her drawings and waiver requests together, and the board would see her back for the

official review in another month or two. Ms. Sipe said that she was waiting at this time for some stump removal and the roads to no longer be posted. Ms. Stewart said Ms. Sipe can speak with the town manager if she needs to get stump removal done sooner, regarding the road postings. Mr. Kiley said Ms. Sipe should speak with Mr. Taylor as well about what waivers are needed.

Ms. Sipe asked the board for something in writing to show what needs to be done, by what date(s) to get everyone on the same page. Chair Fracht asked Ms. Sipe if she would like this before the site plan review. Ms. Sipe said yes. Chair Fracht will put this on the agenda for the first meeting in May (May 11).

VIII. UPDATE ON MASTER PLAN TASK FORCE WORK: DAVID FRACHT

Co-Chair Fracht said there has been good progress on the Master Plan. There were focus groups that provided the task force with a lot of really good feedback. The group has gone through two of the four chapters. The final two chapters will be reviewed April 25th (the week of Town Meeting). Chair Fracht said that his expectation is that he or Co-Chair Lindsay Smith will give a presentation at the Town Meeting (TBD).

Co-Chair Fracht said that since the Planning Board is ultimately responsible for the Master Plan, he wants to have the board look at the drafts as they exist (the same drafts the focus groups saw). This will also benefit board members who may get questions from community members during or after Town Meeting (April 30).

Co-Chair Fracht asked Mr. Taylor to project the drafts for review. He let the board know that the review is not for spelling/grammar/punctuation but is for content and clarity. Co-Chair Fracht said that if there were questions or comments that were already brought up by the focus groups, he would let the board know so they could skip talking about this in the interest of time.

Draft sections were reviewed below.

Vision

Chair Fracht asked for any thoughts on the vision statement and the 7 guiding principles.

Ms. Stewart said that the photo being used was for Lebanon, which is an issue. She also did not love the repetitive language and wording.

Mr. Vermeer said he did not like the vision statement. Ms. Stewart agreed the “will be” statements felt aspirational vs. visionary. Chair Fracht said this has been discussed.

Ms. Stewart suggested citations and cross references across the board, including for photographs used. Several photographs are from Lebanon that are currently part of the draft and need to be changed. Mr. Taylor suggested ariel photographs once the grass comes in a bit more.

There were some additional comments on the 7 guiding principles about wording, order, etc. Co-Chair Fracht took notes of these

Transportation

Board members agreed the start of the Transportation chapter was good with many historical details and facts to introduce the chapter.

Mr. Morris pointed out that the summary comments that highlight important points are good for those who will not read the entire chapter in detail.

Ms. Stewart suggested a title to the page (page 9) with the SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) instead of having “transportation” from each category of the analysis. Mr. Morris agreed that this change would make a bigger impact.

Mr. Gotthardt said that the text about Route 4 and Route 4A (page 7) should include clarification on the users and traffic patterns. Route 4A is the “old I89” and North/South, and Route 4 is the connector road for East/West.

Mr. Gotthardt suggested removing trailheads on the map, they are distracting. They are also not the only trail heads, and this is not a trail map.

Ms. Stewart said she likes the recommendations but questions the order of them and looking at the best order for them. She also suggested information on the Scenic Byway project. Co-Chair Fracht said this has been recommended but is not on this current draft.

Economic Development

Board members agreed that a different photo should be used on the first page instead of the Baltic Mill. Suggested alternate photos included Keene Medical and the School District.

Ms. Stewart said the Census is not her favorite source of data, and the timing for it of 2020 is also challenging. She questioned whether using [Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission](#) data (if any available) might be better. She also suggested acknowledging that the data could be impacted by COVID. Mr. Morris said that he felt it was ok to use. The data shows many people who live here work outside of town, and that data will remain the same even if people are working at home for an employer outside of town.

Ms. Stewart said overall as a comment passive voice should be changed to active voice.

Ms. Stewart and Mr. Morris had the same comment to update the SWOT analysis section with a title and simplified categories.

Housing

Ms. Stewart suggested clarification of the definition of “affordable housing” is a federal definition, and not speaking directly about the percentage of Enfield housing that is affordable.

Ms. Stewart said for graphics (like those on page 23) she likes to know where the data has come from. Co-Chair Fracht said that this draft does not include the hyperlinks that will be embedded into the entire plan as an FYI. Co-Chair Fracht asked the group, the bar graph (on page 23) compares actual increases of housing units over the decades shown, and Lebanon has the largest increase. He asked if they thought changing to percentage increases would be a better way to represent the data. Ms. Stewart suggested the variance as a line over the bars. Mr. Morris suggested information as well, such as did Enfield grow 4% compared to Lebanon’s 12%, etc. Mr. Morris said he cares less about the older data shown on the bar graph (1970-1990) but more about the recent data (2000-2020).

Mr. Bonner left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Gotthardt asked, regarding the bar graph, are the numbers constructed units or approved units? Co-Chair Fracht said he believed the data was building permits/constructed units. Mr. Morris said he would like to see a shorter timeframe and have percentages for this graph instead.

For page 24, Ms. Stewart suggested using the term “age in place housing”.

For the major residential developments, Ms. Stewart suggested arial view might be a better way to represent the data. Mr. Morris wondered if the arial view would be so large that it wouldn’t show the developments well. Mr. Kiley pointed out the Mascoma Heights development was missing and is a good size development that should be added. Mr. Morris suggested comparing the major developments happening between 1970’s-1990’s in Enfield to other Upper Valley towns.

For Unmet and Future Needs, Mr. Kiley suggested changing “Enfield needs...” to “Enfield wants...” statements.

Ms. Stewart suggested removing the promotion of tiny houses. Mr. Morris said they are not legal per the state since they don’t follow building codes. Ms. Stewart suggested changing the language to focus on small-footprint houses. Mr. Kiley and Mr. Morris agreed, “tiny house” is more of a specific term for mobile, small-built homes on wheels. This section is talking more about small footprint homes and camps versus what is defined now as “tiny homes”.

In recommendations, board members agreed it would make sense to put 4-6 A-K in one column instead of separated. Mr. Morris suggested a small photo in the bottom corner of the first column to accomplish this.

Land Use

Ms. Stewart said that the first photo is not a good representation of Land Use.

On page 31, Ms. Stewart asked if there was a better quote that could be used.

On page 32, Mr. Gotthardt suggested changing “Nearly 8,000 acres is unavailable for development” to “Nearly 8,000 acres is protected from development”.

On the map with Important Natural Resource Areas, Mr. Gotthardt said he felt the data needed to be checked on what some of these areas are and if they are correct. There were some that were unfamiliar to him. The board wondered if the location of the numbers for the different resource areas were slightly off in their locations on the map.

Mr. Gotthardt pointed out that the map with different slope data graphs use different percentages. Mr. Morris agreed the labeling should be clarified.

Ms. Stewart suggested a focus on mapping development where infrastructure already exists in addition to the build-out map. Mr. Morris agreed mapping more density in denser areas like downtown might be helpful. Co-Chair Fracht said that the maps and this chapter were still under review. Mr. Gotthardt said the current build-out map may be confusing, particularly to those community members unfamiliar with the zoning etc. It may cause the thought that Enfield plans to build in all these areas which isn’t the case.

Mr. Gotthardt said that the sub-sections H, I, and F (pages 47 and 48) he felt should be broken down into further sub-sections. He suggested it may cause problems or confusion for future zoning regulation changes for areas there might benefit from regulations that differ (the Village as its own district, for example, versus residential districts further out of town).

In the Recommendations section, Ms. Stewart pointed out 5-6 is already a recommendation in the Transportation chapter. Mr. Morris agreed to double-check this across all recommendation sections. He suggested not having the same recommendations in multiple chapters. Ms. Stewart suggested doing a redundancy check across the board among all chapter recommendations. Co-Chair Fracht said that he believed when there is an implementation chapter, all the recommendations will be consolidated and associated with a timeline and responsible person/organization/department etc.

IX. OLD BUSINESS:

None.

X. NEW BUSINESS:

Enfield Planning Board Minutes, April 13, 2022

Mr. Kiley said that the board would need to fill in vacancies. Chair Fracht said that he thought they were in good shape, there were several community members who had expressed interested in joining Planning Board. Ms. Stewart asked if they had submitted the paperwork. Chair Fracht asked Mr. Taylor to follow-up with those individuals who expressed interest to have them complete the paperwork.

XI. NEXT MEETING: April 27, 2022

XII. ADJOURNMENT:

*A MOTION was made by Mr. Kiley to adjourn the meeting at 9:34 p.m.
The MOTION was seconded by Mr. Gotthardt.*

Roll Call Vote:

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

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Whitney Banker
Recording Secretary