



## MEETING MINUTES

### NORTH HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD Regular Meeting August 1, 2005

Page 1 of 3

---

The Town of North Hampton Planning Board met on Monday, August 1, 2005 at 6:30pm in the Mary Herbert Room at the Town Offices.

*\*\* The digital recorder was missing, so they tried to tape the meeting with a regular tape recorder. Neither tape actually recorded anything, so these notes are a general summary.*

#### Attendance

**Present:** (1) Joseph Arena; (2) Laurel Pohl; (3) Craig Solomon; (4) Judy Day; Rich Goeselt; (5) Jill Robertson; (6) Shep Kroner; (8) Phil Wilson; (9) Jon Rineman

**Alternates Present:** None

**Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** (1) Carla Bonney, Recording Secretary

Mr. Wilson called the meeting to order at 6:51pm.

#### Old Business

**Case #05:09 – Crown Properties & Home Sales, LLC/Joseph Roy, PO Box 1627, North Hampton NH 03862** - Proposal is for a subdivision to develop an eight (8) lot Adult Manufactured Housing Park adjacent to an existing housing park. This meeting is a continuation of the July 5, 2005 session. *Property location: 203 Lafayette Road (I-B/R Zone District) Map/Lot #016-012-000, 021-007-000, 017-088 thru 091-000.*

There was discussion among the board, as to what is necessary to fully monument the property. Debate as to whether there would be a call for additional monumentation as the project came to an end. Questions of clarification were asked of John (Chagnon?) Mr. Solomon voiced his opinion that 2 markers should be sufficient

**Mr. Solomon moved and Mr. Rineman seconded the motion to grant the variance with the understanding that there were to be 2 additional markers placed; one in the southwest corner, and one approximately 750 feet to the north.**

***Vote was Unanimous (9:0)***

Discussion as to size of proposed housing units, average lot size, elevation, drainage.

Mr. Wilson confirmed that there is no plan for electric or for street lights; 2 waivers had previously been denied on plans earlier in the process. There were no new plans ready to be brought before the Board.

Mr. Wilson asked about specifics on the lease agreements and how “adult” housing would be specified and enforced. Joe \_\_\_\_\_ (park manager) agreed to get documentation to the Board 1.) in writing; 2.) clarification as to the rules specifying “adult”; 3.) agreement that those rules can not be changed without approval from the Planning Board; 4.) the understanding that if the park did not enforce those rules, the Town of North Hampton would step in.

Discussion as to the safety of a detention pond and whether protective measures should be implemented. The park manager voiced his opinion that the project is bordering on too expensive, and that the “pond” is actually a dry retention area. He felt there would be no accumulation of water for any substantial amount of time. (48 hours max, less than 2 feet deep after the most torrential of rains). Ms. Robertson and Mr. Goeselt voiced their opinion that it would still be an attractive nuisance to children. Discussion as to the fact that it is to be an “adult” housing area and what that means as far as number of children. Attorney Bosen stated that the number of children is steadily declining.

\_\_\_\_\_ pointed out that there could be visiting children at any given time, regardless of resident age.

8:16pm the meeting was opened to the Public. Kathy Gauthier, resident of the current housing development stood for clarification as to how the proposed development would affect more immediate concerns, i.e. getting existing roads fixed, septic tanks pumped, water meters checked. Mr. Chagnon and Joe (park manager) assured the Board and the public that they have made what improvements/fixes they could. It was pointed out that after the proposed project was started, much of the tasks in question would need to be re-done.

Decided that Mr. Wilson, Joe (park manager) and Mr. Mabey needed to get together to come up with a reasonable agreement as to what issues the Town of North Hampton would require park management to address.

9:00pm the meeting was closed to the public.

**Mr. Arena moved and Ms. Pohl seconded to continue Case #05:09 until Tuesday September 6, 2005.**

***Vote was Unanimous (9:0)***

## **New Business**

**Case #05:13 – Laurie Booth, 20 Woodknoll Drive, North Hampton NH 03862 –**  
Change of use for a Hot Dog Cart as a temporary structure. *Property location: 104 Lafayette Road (I-B/R Zone District)*

Ms. Booth has been selling hotdogs out of a cart located on privately owned property for several weeks. She has had the necessary vender's license as well as the property owner's permission to run her business on his land. She brings the cart back and forth with her each day; it does not stay on the property when she is not there.

Discussion as to; whether a hot dog cart can be considered a structure or a vehicle; possibility of proliferation of similar vendors; if on private land would more than the landowners permission be required; legalities other than a state issued license to peddle or hawk; traffic/parking/safety concerns.

Ms. Booth assured the Board that she was constantly aware of where her customers parked, and said she asks them to move their cars before she'll serve them if route 1 is at all obstructed. Her customers do not stay on the property to eat; they usually drive away with their hotdogs. There have been no complaints as to safety or parking thus far.

9:33pm the meeting was opened to the public; nobody was there, so at 9:33pm the meeting was closed to the public.

**Mr. Solomon moved and Mr. Arena seconded the motion to approve Ms. Booth's running of her business through October 31, 2005 or until the expiration of her state issued peddlers/hawkers license. This decision is contingent on having the property owner's permission and that there is off street parking for her customers**  
*Vote was 8:1 with Ms. Day opposed, citing concern over traffic/safety concerns.*

## **Adjournment**

Discussion among the Board as to whether Ms. Booth's hot dog cart might call for a "conditional use" permit in the future or for ordinance consideration.

Meeting at Mr. Goeselt's house; should the public be discouraged from attending?  
Discussion as to whether a public meeting at a Board member's house might be intimidating or discouraging to the public who might have valid questions or constructive criticism worthy of consideration.

9:42pm meeting adjourned