

1 **TOWN OF SUNNAPEE**

2 **PLANNING BOARD**

3 **MARCH 10, 2022**

4 **Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.**

5 **MEMBERS PRESENT BY VIDEO:** None

6 **MEMBERS PRESENT IN THE MEETING ROOM:** Michael Jewczyn, Chairman Peter White, Randy Clark,
7 Jeffrey Claus, Gregory Swick.

8 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Joseph Butler, Suzanne Gottling, Richard Osborne

9 **ALSO PRESENT IN THE MEETING ROOM:** Michael Marquise - Town Planner, Shannon Martinez - Town
10 Manager, Pierre Bedard, Mark McDonough, Peter Blakeman, Ann Bordeianu, Lisa Hoeskstra, Abby Peel

11 **ALSO PRESENT BY VIDEO:** John Norton

12 **Chairman White appointed Gregory Swick to vote in place of Joseph Butler.**

13 **CONSULTATION:**

14 **Parcel ID: 0203-0004-0000 Minor Subdivision Original lot, plus two residential lots, 221 Prospect Hill**
15 **Road, Parsons Family 2021 Irrevocable Trust**

16 Chairman White asks for comments and concerns about the completeness of the application, to which
17 Mr. Marquise comments that documents are in order.

18 **Mr. Clark made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Jewczyn seconded the motion. All**
19 **voted in favor.**

20 Pierre Bedard is the surveyor representing the Parsons family and presenting the case. He explains that
21 lot line is 3.03 acres, and the plan is that it will be purchased by one of the Parsons family members,
22 daughter. The remaining property has no plan of further development.

23 Mr. Marquise asked about the western edge of the property and the fifty' reserve stretch and access to
24 lot three.

25 Mr. Bedard answered that it is part of a larger lot, and it will be used as access to lot 3. It also allowed
26 for creation of the lot without needing to survey the entire existing property line.

27 Mr. Jewczyn asked about the existing bridge, what travels across it and will it be replaced.

28 Mr. Bedard explained that right now they do not plan to do anything on the lot three and it will be
29 maintained as an undeveloped property.

30 Mr. Norton asks about his driveway which is in the back lot of the property on Prospect Hill Road, will it
31 be any impact, to which Mr. Bedard responded that it would not because it is within several hundred
32 feet distance.

33 **Mr. Clark made a motion to approve Minor Subdivision for Parcel ID: 0203-0004-0000. Mr. Claus**
34 **seconded the motion.**

35 Mr. Marquise addresses the State Subdivision construction approval, and the wavers of the application
36 was complete and accepted.

37 All voted in favor.

38 **CONSULTATION:**

39 **Parcel ID:0225-0009-0000 Site Plan Review**

40 **Parcel ID:0225-0009-0001 Construct 13,500SF of storage rentals in two new structures, Lot 0009 &**
41 **0009-0001 to be merged. 15 Route 103 McDonough Family Properties, LLC.**

42 First order of business was the completeness of the application.

43 Mr. Marquise explained that this is not a final application review, and they do not really need to accept
44 it as complete and that the map has the information for design review. The purpose is mostly to look for
45 design elements of the project and to let the applicants know what needs to be addressed before the
46 final hearing or the adjustments that need to be made.

47 Mark McDonough and Peter Blakeman started presenting their case explaining that couple of years ago
48 the McDonough Family came through the Planning Board and subdivided of a 1.3-acre lot which
49 included that brick building, which has been for sale since then, but without any action. They have sold a
50 parcel of the Smith property that they bought years ago to offset some of the environmental expenses
51 that they have occurred to clean up the site. They have bought this really contaminated site planning
52 that at some point they develop it and expand their storage facility which is across the street. The brick
53 building is of a unique character but in a desperate need of attention to bring it back to an occupancy
54 level. Mr. McDonough also said that they renovate historic properties, but the plan here is to raise the
55 building so they can meet proper setbacks in access to remaining parcel on this project, because it does
56 not make any financial sense to renovate it.

57 Mr. Jewczyn asked if there is something currently stored in the building, to which Mr. McDonough
58 answered that the building is empty but that the lot has blue container boxes on that location. He also
59 mentioned that during the clean-up there were all sorts of debris. The building and the site have been
60 cleaned up now and inspected by the environmental survey.

61 Mr. Clark asked if it is a designated brown field, a contaminated site now, according to the State.

62 Mr. McDonough did not want to answer that question, so he does not speak in error, but said that it was
63 definitely a contaminated site before, and the clean-up efforts have all been documented, but he
64 doesn't think it's a brown field site.

65 Mr. Jewczyn asked about the status now and what was the contaminant, to which Mr. McDonough
66 answered that the State had been signed off on it and he does not know. Mr. Jewczyn pointed that the
67 meaning of the site being cleaned now is meeting the threshold of what is allowed.

68 Mr. Clark asked if the DES gave them approval for development on the whole thing, to which Mr.
69 McDonough answered that it was handled as one parcel.

70 Mr. Blakeman continued to explain about the planned drainage system of the two structures, one of
71 9500 sq ft and one of 4000 sq ft, which are at the same elevation. It will be all paved.

72 Mr. Jewczyn has concerns about the source and concentration of contamination and the disturbance of
73 the ground where the building will be raised, which can be cause of contamination to the river, so he is
74 asking for more tests to the soil around the building.

75 Mr. Clark is asking if the State was aware that the building is planned to be taken down when it signed
76 off that the site was clean, to which Mr. McDonough answered that few years ago when other buildings
77 nearby were planned to be taken down, the State was aware of that, and they knew about their
78 intentions to develop that site.

79 Mr. Marquise addressed the concern for the pipe that is leaning from the building or going to the river,
80 which needs to be removed.

81 Chairman White discussed about the need of having green space, trees, nice landscape around the
82 property and asked if the final plan was to merge both lots.

83 The answer from Mr. Blakeman was that it is ten acres of land that is planned to be merged.

84 The Board discussed and addressed concerns about the movement of the traffic at the intersection from
85 the gate which is planned to be seventy feet from the street, and about other businesses being there
86 like the Dollar Store, which will contribute to the traffic congestion. They have established that DOT had
87 approved two commercial entrances to the site.

88 Chairman White asked the applicants if there is a need for that much storage space in the Town of
89 Sunapee and suggested that they contact the Conservation Commission ahead of time about their
90 concerns about the development of retail businesses before. Then he asked if there are questions from
91 the audience.

92 Question from John S., Abutter, he does not think that an adequate review was done over the Dollar
93 store regarding Conservation Commission so he suggested that the Boards communicate directly with
94 the Conservation Commission about their concerns not only for the waterfront but as well as
95 contamination issues of the properties and would like better landscaping around the property.

96 Jim D. also talked about landscaping and that should be improvements there, with bigger trees/plants,
97 hazardous intersection because of the storage unit. Also mentioned the blue boxes that are uglier than
98 the storage units and asked if they are going to be there all the time.

99 Mr. Marquise answered that it is being looked into, but no final decisions/determinations have been
100 made about the blue boxes.

101 Mr. McDonough noted that that landscape plan for the previous project was made by specifications,
102 was approved, and said that the blue boxes are not here for long term.

103 Mr. Neil made few points for the Board: South side of the South building appears to be very close to the
104 wet area, whereas it should have 25' buffer setback from the wet area. The setback from the road
105 appears to be from the center line, whether that should be from property line or center line. The
106 drainage study should be a 10-year storm standard. Regarding the screening, he thinks one of the issues

107 might be on the mixed use one area, and according to the Ordinance 3.40o mixed use three requires a
108 buffer.

109 Mr. Marquise answered that the wet area is not mapped, because it is a small wetland area and that is
110 why it is allowed to build there. For the roads, the setback should be from the center line. The drainage
111 study in their project is a 10-year storm standard. He also explained that the purpose of Ordinance 3.40o
112 was mostly for the open highway, which is why it is not required for a 25' buffer for commercial
113 businesses.

114 The applicant will take the Board's comments and make adjustments to the plans for a final hearing in
115 the near future.

116 **Short Term Rental Discussion**

117 Chairman White moved to the next item: "General discussion related to Short-Term Rentals",
118 responding to the Open letter from three abutters Ann Bordeianu, Lisa Hoekstra and Abby Peel, asking
119 the Planning Board to review and reverse their decision against requiring a Site Plan Review on 22 Maple
120 Street, where Mrs. Wolf intends to transform the six-unit apartment building from long term into short
121 term stays – rentals.

122 The abutters are saying that they are concerned about public health, safety, welfare of their
123 neighborhood and community.

124 Ms. Hoekstra asked the Planning Board if their duty is to trust or trust and verify the applicants. She
125 mentioned the pictures of the building that were send with the letter, mentioning that the building is
126 unsafe, to which the Board responded that that is a Building Code issue which they do not have as a
127 town, it is State's responsibility.

128 Mr. Jewczyn responded that she is expressing her opinion on the matters written in the letter, without
129 consulting a professional on those matters, and that everybody has the right on opinion, as well as to do
130 what is the best for them with their property.

131 Chairman White noted that it is an existing building already and it has been operating as a rental
132 building, which is why the Board has decided that there is no need for a Site Plan Review.

133 Ms. Hoekstra asked if they could request for a revote on the Board's next meeting, to which the Board
134 responded that they would need to have a base for that through a violation of an Ordinance or error in
135 procedure, and they could appeal it to the Zoning Board.

136 It was also discussed about the enforcement of the codes, rules, and regulations.

137 **Michael Jewczyn made a motion to adjourn at 10:30 pm. Seconded by Jeffrey Claus. The motion**
138 **passed unanimously.**

139 Respectfully submitted: Rajmonda Selimi

140 Planning Board

141 _____

142 Peter White, Chairman

Michael Jewczyn

143

144

Randy Clark

Jeffrey Claus

145

146

Gregory Swick