

1 **TOWN OF SUNAPEE**

2 **PLANNING BOARD**

3 **NOVEMBER 8, 2018**

4 **PRESENT:** Peter White, Chair; Richard Osborne; Joseph Butler; Randy Clark; Michael Jewczyn, Alternate;
5 Jeffrey Claus, Alternate; Suzanne Gottling, Ex-Officio Member; Michael Marquise, Planner

6 **ABSENT:** Donna Davis Larrow; Joseph Furlong

7 **See attached sign in sheet**

8 Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

9 Chairman White appointed Mr. Jewczyn to sit in for Mrs. Larrow for the meeting.

10 **PARCEL ID: 0106-0021-0000: SITE PLAN REVIEW: AMENDMENT TO EXISTING APPROVED SITE PLAN**
11 **DATED 06/02/2016 TO CHANGE THE LOCATION OF A PERVIOUS PATHWAY. 1250 ROUTE 11; HK**
12 **SUNAPEE COVE, LLC.**

13 Mr. Marquise said that the abutters were notified, notices were posted, and the fees were paid. The
14 application falls under the Site Plan Review Regulations and the original Site Plan previously met all the
15 Article V requirements and was accepted by the Board. Mr. Marquise continued that he believes that
16 the application is complete based on the submitted drawings.

17 Mr. Clark made a motion to accept the application as complete. Vice Chair Osborne seconded the
18 motion. The motion passed unanimously.

19 Brian Vincent and Daniel Monette from Fuss & O'Neill Engineers presented the merits of the case.

20 Mr. Vincent explained that they would like to revise the approved patio and walkway because the
21 original walkway accessed the original assisted living facility and they want to change the walkway so it
22 is for the new memory care unit. There will be a fence around the walkway as well as a small gate to
23 prevent people from wandering off, though anyone using that facility would be accompanied by staff.
24 Mr. Vincent continued that the purpose of the walkway is to allow people to be able to enjoy the lake.

25 Mr. Vincent said that the patio has been revised; the square footage remains the same but the
26 landscape architects wanted a different size and shape. There are a series of windows that are for living
27 areas inside and they didn't want the patio near the windows.

28 Mr. Jewczyn asked if the walkway will be closer to the lake and Mr. Vincent said that some of the
29 elements of the walkway are the same and explained the changes that will be made and said that the
30 area is already being used. Mr. Jewczyn asked and Mr. Vincent confirmed that they have received an
31 Amendment to the original Shoreland Permit and have an email from Craig Day at DES confirming the
32 modification. Mr. Jewczyn asked and Mr. Monette explained where the excavation will take place on
33 the site for the walkway. Mr. Monette was asked and explained the erosion control plan to the Board.

34 Mr. Butler asked and Mr. Vincent explained that the walkway will be handicap accessible. Mr. Clark
35 asked why the walkway was not planned like this before. Mr. Vincent explained that they received Site
36 Plan approval very early in the process and once it was done the architects looked at the plan and it
37 became apparent that the design of the walkway would not work. There was further discussion
38 regarding this matter and the shed that was approved after the original Site Plan.

39 Chairman White asked and Mr. Vincent confirmed that the patio will be built from pervious pavers.

40 Mr. Jewczyn asked if there is a fire or emergency where the people in the memory care facility would go
41 to escape. Mr. Vincent said that he is not the code reviewer and does not know, there are exits
42 throughout the building but he is not sure that this walkway would be used. There was further
43 discussion regarding this matter and that the gate will probably have an alarm.

44 Mr. Vincent explained that the fence is required for code, however, the engineers do not know what
45 they will use to build it.

46 Mr. Marquise said that there will be one or two retaining walls but none will be over 42 inches. Mr.
47 Vincent explained that they are trying to talk the owner out of doing the walls, however, if they do build
48 them, none will be over 42 inches.

49 Mr. Jewczyn asked and Mr. Vincent said that he thinks that the memory care building will be completed
50 in the spring. The walkway and patio will be completed as soon as possible. Mr. Claus asked and Mr.
51 Vincent said that there are three decorative trees and they wanted to save them and he is not sure that
52 they can, however, if they need to be removed they will be replaced. There was further discussion
53 regarding the trees and landscaping.

54 Mr. Clark asked and the engineers confirmed that they have all of the approvals needed from the State.
55 There was a discussion regarding the impact on the natural woodland buffer per the plan.

56 Mr. Clark asked if anyone will monitor the water. Mr. Vincent said that the contractors do self-monitor
57 and they also have visited the site and recommended improvements. There was a discussion regarding
58 the retention pond.

59 Mr. Marquise said that he knows that there have been some discussions regarding the fire lane and he
60 spoke with the Fire Chief about it. The Fire Chief's concerns is that if the fire lane is grassed per the
61 State's request then it will not be accessible all winter, which he feels is necessary. Mr. Monette said
62 that he has discussed with the owners some different technology for the fire lane such as grass pavers
63 or geo grids that will be able to stay green but still have the stability. They have an impervious limit that
64 they cannot exceed and are at 37% currently; if they change the fire lane to a paved area the impervious
65 area will increase quite a bit. There was continued discussion regarding this matter and that it is not a
66 condition of this request but the engineers said that they will work with the Fire Chief on the issues.

67 Chairman White asked and there were not additional questions or comments for the applicant.

68 Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the amendment to the existing approved Site Plan for Parcel ID:
69 0106-0021-0000. Vice Chair Osborne seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

70 **OTHER BUSINESS: ZONING AMENDMENTS**

71 Chairman White appointed Mr. Claus as a voting member for the meeting.

72 Mr. Marquise said that the proposed Zoning Amendments will be posted to the Town's website.

73 Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that the meeting in December will be the public
74 meeting on the Zoning Amendments. The Amendments will be voted on individually to be sent to the
75 Warrant for voting on at the Town Meeting.

76 Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that the draft Zoning Amendments have been sent
77 to the Zoning Board, who did not give any feedback on them. The only one that he knows that they
78 have any issues with is Section 3.50 (i) which has to do with height.

79 **Amendment #1**

80 Amend Article III, Section 3.50 (f) by clarifying that the exception allows lateral expansions only (i.e. no
81 closer to the road) and that any expansion must be at least 10' from the Right-of-Way.

82 The full text of Section 3.50(f) as amended will be as follows:

83 If a pre-existing primary structure is non-conforming due to inadequate front setback, the ZBA may
84 allow additions *within the front setback provided that the following conditions are met:*

85 *1) the addition does not further decrease the front setback*

86 *2) the addition is at least 10' from the right-of-way at all points*

87 *3) the addition is no higher than the predominant ridge line of the existing building.*

88 The Board agreed that this Amendment makes sense. Mr. Marquise explained that the prior wording
89 did not include the setback from the right of way.

90 **Amendment #2**

91 Amend Article III, Section 3.50 (i) by deleting provision (1) of the section to remove reference to
92 horizontal expansion.

93 The full text of Section 3.50 (i) as amended will be as follows:

94 The ZBA may allow a pre-existing non-conforming structure to undergo vertical expansion or be
95 replaced with a higher structure provided that:

96 1) deleted

97 2) the existing structure is a house (living *space* only), garage or commercial building;

98 3) the existing structure is less than 24' in height;

99 4) the vertical expansion will be no more than 10' higher than the pre-existing structure,

100 3) any roof changes are within the height requirements set for in this Ordinance;

101 6) in the judgment of the ZBA no abutter will be adversely affected by the enlargement (loss of view will
102 not be considered an adverse impact);

103 7) all state and local permits are acquired to insure compliance with Article VII of the Ordinance;

104 8) such enlargement or replacement, in the judgment of the ZBA, is consistent with the intent of the
105 Ordinance.

106 Mr. Marquise explained that Section 3.50 (i)(1) is being deleted at the request of the Zoning Board.
107 They were concerned that this was already taken care of with the Amendment to Section 6.12 and this is
108 for vertical expansions. Additionally, 3.50(i)(2) has been changed from "living area" to "living space"
109 because they are going to define "living space". Mr. Clark asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that there
110 should be a comma after "ZBA" in Section 3.50 (i)(6).

111 Donna Nashawaty, the Town Manager, said that there was a discussion at the last Zoning Minutes
112 regarding the Zoning Amendments and a case that was heard regarding the height of the structure. Mr.
113 Claus explained that the case was to increase the height of a roofline and the applicants were stating the
114 existing height of the building was 23 ft 11 inches but the building had been torn down. The applicants
115 asked to go to 33 ft so the Zoning Board saw that the enlargement was within the 40 ft height
116 requirement and there was not going to be a loss of a view so the request was approved.

117 **Amendment #3**

118 Amend Article VI, Section 6.12 to indicate that non-conforming structures may be replaced in a smaller
119 envelope.

120 The full text of Section 6.12 as amended will be as follows:

121 A Pre-Existing, Non-Conforming Structure existing at the time of the passage of this Ordinance (March
122 18, 1987) may be replaced in the same *or smaller* envelope by a new structure having the same purpose
123 and use provided that the non-conformity to this Ordinance is not increased thereby. The reconstruction
124 of any other non-conforming structure requires a variance or special exception of the Zoning Board of
125 Adjustment.

126 The replacement of a non-conforming structure with a structure that increases the non-conformity to
127 this Ordinance, either vertically or horizontally, shall only be permitted by variance or, if permitted
128 hereby, by Special Exception.

129 Mr. Marquise explained that they are only adding the words "or smaller" as it was felt by the Zoning
130 Board that this needed to be stated. Mr. Clark asked how it will be worded on the ballot. Mr. Marquise
131 explained that the entire wording is not on the ballot, it is generalized; the hope is that the voter has
132 looked into the wording. Mrs. Nashawaty explained that the Deliberative Booklet that is sent out does
133 contain the full text as does the Town Report. The posted Warrant does not include the full wording.
134 Mr. Marquise explained that one year Newport had approximately 15 Zoning Amendments and they put
135 the full wording on the ballot, which ended up being 37 pages. There was further discussion regarding
136 the Deliberative Booklet.

137 **Amendment #4**

138 Amend Article VIII, Section 8.21 to better define which construction activities require a Certificate of
139 Zoning Compliance.

140 The full text of Section 8.21 as amended will be as follows:

141 8.21 Certificate Required if:

142 (a) a new structure is to be constructed or installed;

143 (b) an existing structure is *to undergo expansion*;

144 (c) additional dwelling units are to be added to the existing structure;

145 (d) any municipal structure is to be constructed or undergo expansion;

146 *(e) a bedroom or kitchen is to be added to an existing structure*;

147 (f) a structure is to be demolished;

148 (g) a Site Plan Review Approval has been granted by the Planning Board

149 Mr. Clark asked and Mr. Marquise explained that (b) has been changed because “expansion” is now
150 defined. Vice Chair Osborne asked if (c) means that a structure is being added to inside the existing unit.
151 Mr. Marquise explained that this would happen if there was a structure such as a space over a garage
152 where someone wanted to add an apartment to.

153 Mr. Claus asked what happens if he wants to put a home theater room into his house. Mr. Marquise
154 said that it would not require a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (CZC). Chairman White said that a CZC
155 is not a building permit and the discussion the Board had at the last meeting was regarding why interior
156 work done to someone’s house would not require a CZC if there is no part of the Ordinance that it needs
157 to comply with.

158 Mrs. Nashawaty said that there is a new Zoning Administrator who questioned the approval process for
159 the CZCs and created a new draft document. The Board of Selectmen (BOS), who is charged with doing
160 the approval process for the CZC’s, asked to see the draft document and said that some of the things
161 were not quite clear. Mrs. Nashawaty continued that she, the Zoning Administrator, and the Assessor
162 got together and discussed that things that do not necessarily have to do with Zoning will not be caught
163 as they have been. She went to the BOS to discuss with them these things and asked how to handle it if
164 someone purchases a fixer upper to renovate and it would not trigger a CZC. She suggested to the BOS
165 doing a no fee permit that would catch the items that would not trigger a CZC. The Town’s attorney said
166 that this can be added to the Zoning Ordinance or can be required separately. The BOS suggested
167 requiring permits for renovations over a certain dollar amount and anything under those amounts
168 would be picked up by the Assessors during sale visits or the revaluation that is done every five years
169 though the entry rate is only 20% - 25%. Mrs. Nashawaty continued that someone should not be
170 permitted to renovate their house and escape taxation for it because then other people are paying for
171 their share; it seems reasonable to do a no fee permit, otherwise, the Town won’t know unless someone
172 tells them about it.

173 Chairman White asked about landscape features as they make as much of an impact on a property as a
174 kitchen. Norm Bernaiche, the Assessor, explained that landscaping features do not have as much impact
175 because a nicer house will often have nicer landscape features.

176 Chairman White said that it sounds like the biggest concern is getting the most tax value for the town.
177 Mr. Bernaiche said that his mandate and the BOS' mandate is to be fair and reasonable. The BOS must
178 be fair and reasonable to the tax payers and to have people have fair assessments. In the past, they
179 were able to be fair because people were getting permits and they have been able to maintain a fair and
180 equitable tax system. There was further discussion regarding this matter and how we live in a "Property
181 Tax State" so this is a bigger issue for revenue and being fair.

182 Mr. Bernaiche said that under Section 8.21 (b) he would consider a media room or a finished basement
183 an expansion. The Board said that they do not think that it would qualify as an expansion. Mr. Claus
184 said that he has seen a dollar value assigned to major alterations.

185 Mr. Bernaiche said that there are a lot of taxpayers who want to make sure they do due diligence and
186 make sure their file is complete. The work on someone's house also affects mortgage values, property
187 insurance etc. There was a property in Newbury who replaced her roof a year ago and did not get a
188 permit. The roof was faulty and because there was no record there was no protection for her. Mr.
189 Bernaiche continued that taxpayers want to make sure that they get everything they need and that
190 there should be something to help with this process. Chairman White said that this is typically done
191 through a building permit process. Mr. Butler said that the Town would need to hire a building
192 inspector. Mrs. Nashawaty said that she does not know that would be approved. The BOS does not
193 think that there would be anyone who would do renovations and not think that they would require
194 some type of a permit and there should be a mechanism to capture them.

195 Vice Chair Osborne asked if Mrs. Nashawaty wanted to include a value amount for a renovation that
196 would require a permit. Mrs. Nashawaty confirmed this and asked Mr. Bernaiche how much he thinks it
197 should be. Mr. Bernaiche said that he'd like it to be \$10,000, however, there can be an issue when
198 someone replaces a roof, which can be a maintenance issue or can be something that people are
199 receiving a discount on if their roof is poor. The permits have always been the practice in Sunapee and
200 people are used to doing them. Mr. Bernaiche continued that not doing them will make his job more
201 difficult. He is paid to be fair and equitable and it will be harder to do that and to keep assessments fair.

202 Mrs. Nashawaty said that she would like clarity on Section 8.21 (b) regarding the expansion and asked if
203 it is just a footprint expansion as she thinks there will be a struggle with this. Mr. Marquise said that he
204 thinks that this is clear because "expansion" and "envelope" are defined.

205 Mr. Claus said that adding a bedroom or a kitchen is important, however, he thinks that a nominal value
206 for improvements and upgrades is reasonable. Mr. Butler asked how much the Town does on permit
207 fees every year. Mrs. Nashawaty said that they have looked at them recently and the fees should cover
208 the Planning and Zoning expenses but do not even pay for the Zoning Administrator. Mr. Butler said
209 that where he used to live the building department made a lot of money for the town. Mrs. Nashawaty
210 said that town probably has more and higher fees. Mr. Butler asked and Mr. Bernaiche said that he
211 would not need a building inspector. Mrs. Nashawaty explained that when the Zoning Administrator
212 works with the customer to fill out the CZC application, they tell her what they are doing and that

213 triggers a need for an approval from the BOS. The CZC is then processed and a trigger goes onto the
214 assessing database to get picked up in the spring. Mr. Butler asked and Mr. Bernaiche said that he gets
215 into properties with new construction, he only gets into 25% or so of the properties they visit during a
216 revaluation. They gather data from drive-bys that occur every 5 years and from MLS data, the CZC
217 process, and Site Plan approvals; they look at all land uses because it all effects values.

218 Vice Chair Osborne asked if Section 8.21 (b) can be changed to "expansion of the living space". Mr.
219 Marquise said that it can, however, if they are dealing with a no fee permit he would put it separately.
220 He recommends saying "(h) interior renovations in excess of _____, not included in a-g above, no fee will
221 be required under this sub-section." Vice Chair Osborne said that if the permits are not paying for the
222 Zoning Administrator now then there should be a fee. Mr. Marquise said that if the Town is not
223 providing a service towards the permit then there should not be a fee. Mrs. Nashawaty said that the
224 laws are clear on how the Town can charge for a permit.

225 Chairman White said that he understands the Town's concern that they want to account for these things
226 but they are not willing to put the process in place and pay for it. They are trying to fill the void that
227 there is because there is not a building inspector. Mr. Clark asked and it was confirmed that Newbury
228 has a building inspector and New London has a zoning administrator. Mr. Clark asked and Mr. Bernaiche
229 explained that New London historically does the same process as Sunapee. Mr. Bernaiche said that
230 there needs to be a mechanism to make things fair; someone could renovate their house and put value
231 into it but the value might not be picked up for years.

232 Mrs. Nashawaty said that one of the things that the Town's attorney said that it makes more sense to
233 have something in the Zoning Ordinance rather than done as a BOS Ordinance. This the BOS has the
234 authority to approve the CZC and to assess the fair and true value.

235 Chairman White said that if he is redoing his bathroom he would not think about getting a permit. Mrs.
236 Nashawaty said that most contractors do ask if permits are needed. There was further discussion
237 regarding this matter.

238 There was a discussion regarding building permits and if the Town needs a building inspector. There
239 was also a discussion regarding Site Plans and what changes might require a new Site Plan Review.

240 Mrs. Nashawaty asked how this Amendment will appear on the ballot. Mr. Marquise confirmed that it
241 would say "Amend Article VIII, Section 8.21 to better define which construction activities require a
242 Certificate of Zoning Compliance."

243 Mr. Claus asked if someone has an unfinished basement and wanted to add living space if that would
244 require a CZC or if another line should be added for this. Mr. Marquise explained that the no fee permit
245 would cover this.

246 Mr. Marquise asked the Board if they think that adding the no fee permit language is what they would
247 like to do. Vice Chair Osborne said that he thinks that it is a good idea. Mr. Claus asked and Mr.
248 Marquise re-read the proposed language. Mr. Claus said that he thinks the language is very good. Mr.
249 Clark said that he does not like that there is a dollar amount. Mr. Butler said that it should not matter
250 because there is no fee.

251 Mr. Jewczyn said that he feels as though the Planning Board is being tasked to do the job of someone
252 else that no one else wants to do. Mrs. Nashawaty said that the Planning Board gives the BOS the
253 authority to grant CZC's. The Planning Board also sets the rules that the BOS uses to approve or deny
254 through the Zoning Ordinance; there are things in the Zoning Ordinance that cause an effect on other
255 areas.

256 Chairman White said that the gist of the discussion is trying to include things that have nothing to do
257 with Zoning is the Zoning Ordinance so that the Town can be noticed that work is being done and then
258 they can more fairly assess the property. Mr. Bernaiche said that it is also something that has always
259 been done.

260 Mr. Claus asked why adding a bathroom does not matter but adding a bedroom or a kitchen does. Mr.
261 Marquise explained that a bathroom does not have relevance to Zoning. Mrs. Nashawaty said that a
262 septic system looks at the number of bedrooms.

263 Mr. Butler asked and Mr. Marquise explained that the BOS' authority to grant or deny CZC's is allowed
264 under Section 8.11; Section 8.21 tells when a CZC is required.

265 Mr. Clark asked and Mr. Marquise said that Section 8.21 (e) was never formally adopted so that needs to
266 be corrected. The proposed change would essentially put (e) back in the Ordinance.

267 There was a discussion regarding demolishing buildings and then rebuilding them and how the
268 dimensions are determined.

269 Vice Chair Osborne said that he likes the language that Mr. Marquise is proposing, however, the higher
270 the dollar amount allowed, the more wiggle room people will have. Mr. Claus said that it also goes
271 towards defining a major alteration because everything that is not a major alteration would be included
272 in this no fee permit. Mr. Jewczyn said that if an amount is added then a person will always say that
273 their work is less than the amount. There was further discussion regarding the dollar amount and how it
274 was previously determined.

275 Chairman White said that he disagrees that the assessing changes should be done through Zoning. Vice
276 Chair Osborne said that unless the Town wants to have a separate process with a building inspector and
277 pay more taxes to pay for a building inspector, this is the way that works. Mrs. Gottling said that the
278 Town might work towards having a building inspector, however, in the meantime, the Town's attorney
279 said that this proposal fits.

280 Mr. Jewczyn asked and Mr. Marquise said that the Zoning Administrator has the authority to look at
281 how much a project costs. Vice Chair Osborne said that a permit might not trigger a full reassessment of
282 someone's house. Mr. Jewczyn asked if he builds a three car shed if someone will go to his property and
283 determine it is a three car garage. It was explained that the assessors go to the properties and change
284 the tax assessments based on the permits and this allows the assessors to know what is going on.

285 Mr. Butler said that he thinks that the BOS should force the Town Manager to look at getting a building
286 inspector because the revenue for the Town would be beneficial. Mrs. Gottling said that Mr. Butler can
287 make an appointment with the BOS if he would like to talk about this matter.

288 The Board discussed how much the dollar amount should be in order to require a no fee permit and
289 decided use a \$25,000 value.

290 Chairman White requested and Mr. Marquise read the language of the proposed Amendment ““(h)
291 interior renovations in excess of \$25,000, not included in a-g above, (no fee will be required under this
292 sub-section).”

293 Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the wording that Mr. Marquise gave. Mrs. Gottling seconded the
294 motion. The motion passed with six in favor and one opposed.

295 **Amendment #5**

296 Amend Article XI by adding a definition of Land Clearing which will include activities associated with
297 forestry operations.

298 The full text of the definition of Land Clearing will be as follows:

299 *Land Clearing – The removal of vegetation associated with forestry or agricultural operations. This*
300 *includes only the removal of trees and vegetation but not stumping or other activities included in the*
301 *definition of Land Disturbance.*

302 There was no discussion regarding this Amendment.

303 **Amendment #6**

304 Amend Article XI by adding a definition of Land Disturbance which will include activities related to
305 excavation and earth moving.

306 The full text of the definition of Land Disturbance will be as follows:

307 *Land Disturbance – Any activity which disturbs the ground surface. This includes but is not limited to*
308 *excavation, grading, cuts/fills, grubbing, and other earth moving activities.*

309 Mr. Jewczyn asked about properties where there is active removal of large rocks but not a mining
310 operation because the rocks are on the surface and asked what this is classified as because it is not land
311 disturbance. Mr. Marquise said that this comes back to the Ordinance regarding the amount of square
312 footage of disturbance. Mr. Jewczyn asked if they cut the rocks if it is mining. Mr. Marquise explained
313 that mining involves excavation. Mr. Jewczyn said that a lot of masons take slabs from surface rocks.
314 Mr. Marquise said that he does not believe that is mining or quarrying.

315 The Board agreed that the Amendment is good as written.

316 **Amendment #7**

317 Amend Article XI by adding a definition of Living Space that includes areas of a house used for gathering,
318 eating, sleeping or hygiene.

319 The full text of the definition of Living Space will be as follows:

320 *Living Space – The area of a structure that is used primarily for gathering, eating, sleeping, or hygiene. It*
321 *includes enclosed porches but does not include decks or open porches.*

322 Mr. Jewczyn asked if this means that decks or open porches cannot become living space without an
323 additional request. Mr. Marquise said that there are sections of the Ordinance that talk about
324 expanding living space. This is just a definition of what is living space; living space cannot just be
325 expanded over or under a deck. Chairman White recommended adding wording that says “for the
326 purpose of this definition” before “does not include decks or open porches” because people can eat or
327 sleep on a porch. Mr. Marquise said that they could take out the “open porch” so that it is not
328 contradictory and the Board agreed.

329 **Amendment #8**

330 Amend Article XI by adding a definition of Primary Structure which will include structures such as homes,
331 garages, commercial buildings, and institutional buildings.

332 The full text of the definition of Primary Structure will be as follows:

333 *Primary Structure – A primary structure includes homes, garages, commercial buildings, and institutional*
334 *buildings. It does not include sheds, decks, or similar structures.*

335 Vice Chair Osborne asked about patios and Mr. Marquise said that “patios” was in the original proposed
336 language and was asked to be stricken. Mr. Claus asked about agricultural buildings as Enfield’s
337 definition includes agricultural buildings. Mr. Claus asked where in the Ordinance the term “primary
338 structure” is used and if a barn / agricultural building would fit in that Section. Mr. Marquise said that it
339 is under Section 3.50 (f) and the concept is to not have a shed be expanded in the front setback. Mr.
340 Claus asked if an agricultural building falls under a commercial building. Mr. Marquise asked if they
341 added “barn” if that would work. Mr. Claus said that an “agricultural building” might be better because
342 it covers more than just barns. Mr. Marquise said that this Ordinance applies to existing buildings that
343 are non-conforming and if there are not any agricultural buildings in the Town that are non-conforming
344 then it might not matter. The Board agreed to the proposed Amendment as written.

345 Mr. Marquise said that the proposed Amendments will be sent to the paper and the public hearing will
346 be held in December.

347 **MISCELLANEOUS**

348 There was a discussion regarding the law that says that one member of the Planning Board can also be
349 on the Zoning Board. Mr. Claus is serving as an alternate member on both Boards.

350 **MINUTES**

351 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from October 10, 2018:

352 The minutes were postponed until the December meeting.

353 **MISCELLANEOUS**

354 Mr. Marquise said that the Town of Sunapee came in 4th for the grant for the funds for the Route 11
355 project and they will try again next year. Mrs. Gottling asked and Mr. Marquise explained that the
356 application was scored based on need. Mr. Marquise said that a lot of the feedback that was received
357 was pertinent to the safety and the traffic calming. They tried to put the connection of the two areas of
358 the Town together but it didn't mean the same as it would for a big city so they did not get a lot of
359 points for that.

360 Mr. Marquise asked about the CIP Committee and Mr. Clark said that there isn't anything specific that
361 he needs to talk to the Board about. Mr. Marquise said that they have talked to the school and to Fire
362 Chief Ruggles. Mr. Clark said that some of the biggest items that were discussed were related to the
363 Recreation Committee; they want to redo Veteran's Field and it ties together with the Route 11 project
364 and with the school. There was a discussion regarding the school project and the field.

365 Mr. Marquise said that he would like to change the applications to require pdf documents submitted for
366 plans and then the agendas and all the supporting documents will be turned into pdfs. The agenda and
367 supporting documents would then be uploaded online. Mr. Marquise asked and the Board agreed that
368 they would like to access their packets electronically. Mr. Marquise said that the Town will not be
369 providing tablets or laptops for this purpose. Vice Chair Osborne asked and Mr. Marquise said that he
370 spoke with Mrs. Nashawaty regarding having a screen set up so that things are displayed on that. Mr.
371 Claus asked and Mr. Marquise said that the packets can still be printed at the Town Office if a Board
372 member needs one.

373 Mr. Marquise said that the Subdivision and Site Plan Regulations will probably be ready to hold a public
374 hearing in January or February.

375 **MYLAR – MCCARTHY SUBDIVISION**

376 Mr. Marquise gave the Board the Mylar for the McCarthy Subdivision on Lake Ave to sign to be recorded
377 and gave a brief explanation regarding the path that was discussed and that no one has rights to use it.

378 Mr. Clark made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:16 pm. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The
379 motion passed unanimously.

380 Respectfully submitted,

381 Melissa Pollari

382

383

384

385

386

387

388 Planning Board

389 _____

390 Peter White, Chairman

Richard Osborne, Vice Chair

391 _____

392 Donna Davis Larrow

Joseph Butler

393 _____

394 Joseph Furlong

Randy Clark

395 _____

396 Michael Jewczyn, Alternate

Jeffrey Claus, Alternate

397 _____

398 Suzanne Gottling, ex-officio member

399