

1 **TOWN OF SUNAPEE**

2 **PLANNING BOARD**

3 **August 10, 2023**

4 **Chairman White called the meeting to order and conducted a roll call at 7:00 PM.**

5 **MEMBERS PRESENT BY VIDEO:** Richard Osborne

6 **MEMBERS PRESENT IN THE MEETING ROOM:** Gregory Swick, Jeff Claus, Randy Clark, Joseph Butler,
7 Chairman Peter White, Suzanne Gottling, Robin Saunders.

8 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

9 **ALSO PRESENT IN THE MEETING ROOM:** Michael Marquise - Town Planner, Allyson Traeger - Land Use
10 and Assessing Coordinator.

11 **ALSO PRESENT BY VIDEO:** None

12 **Chairman White at the beginning recused himself from the case. He appointed Mr. Butler as a voting**
13 **member for that case.**

14 **NEW CASES:**

15 **CASE # TC 23-21 PARCEL ID: 0128-0065-0000 PER ARTICLE IV SECTION 4.33 (B)(8)(B)(I)(1): A CUTTING**
16 **AND CLEARING PLAN SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD FOR THE**
17 **FOLLOWING: CUTTING WITHIN THE NATURAL WOODLAND BUFFER OF MORE THAN FIVE (5) HEALTHY**
18 **TREES IN ANY 12-MONTH PERIOD.**

19 After a short discussion, the members stated that the fees were paid, abutters were notified, and agreed
20 on the completeness of the application.

21 **Mr. Claus made a motion to accept the application as complete. Seconded by Mr. Clark. The motion**
22 **passed unanimously.**

23 The applicant Phillip Harrel introduced himself along with the architect Chriss Kessler who helped
24 prepare the application and discussed the specifics. The application sought approval for the removal of
25 five additional trees within a 12-month period, in addition to the five trees that had already been
26 approved in a previous zoning compliance application. The purpose of the tree removal was to facilitate
27 construction and improve safety around a property located near Lake Sunapee.

28 He further explained that the initial zoning compliance application had been submitted after going
29 through an extensive site development process, which included review by the zoning board and
30 environmental assessments. The original submission had outlined the removal of ten trees, but since
31 then, changes in interpretation have necessitated the amendment of the application to include the five
32 trees that were adjacent to the building.

33 The trees in question included two birch tree stems, a maple tree, and two pine trees. The Applicant
34 provided detailed explanations for each tree, highlighting factors such as their location, potential root
35 disturbance, and safety concerns. He emphasized that the removal of these trees would aid in the
36 construction process and enhance the safety of the property.

37 The Planning Board members raised questions about the tree removal requirements and the state's
38 involvement in the process. It was clarified that the state did not approve individual tree removals, but
39 rather set minimum standards for tree conservation. Since the proposed tree removals did not fall
40 below these standards, state approval was not required.

41 The Board inquired about objections from abutters and whether any public comments had been
42 received.

43 The Applicant indicated that notices had been sent to abutters, but no objections or comments had
44 been received.

45 A question was raised by Bill Weaver, who inquired about the requirements within the buffer zone and
46 whether the tree removal was solely due to construction needs. It was clarified that the focus was
47 indeed for construction purposes, and the proposal already met setback requirements from the lake.

48 Further questions arose about setback regulations and the ordinance. The discussion emphasized that
49 within 150 feet of the lake, all tree removals were subject to review by the town. The distinction
50 between the 250-foot and 150-foot zones was explained, with attention given to trees both within and
51 outside the zone surrounding the house construction area.

52 Regarding objections from abutters, it was confirmed that no objections or letters of concern had been
53 received. The Board then engaged in a conversation about the grounds for approval or denial of tree
54 removal requests. The discussion touched upon factors such as basal area calculations and the power to
55 require replanting.

56 **Mr. Claus made a motion to accept Case # TC 23-21 Parcel ID: 0128-0065-0000 Per Article IV Section**
57 **4.33 (B)(8)(b)(I)(1): A cutting and clearing plan shall be subject to the approval of the Planning Board**
58 **for the following: Cutting within the Natural Woodland Buffer of more than five (5) healthy trees in**
59 **any 12-month period. Seconded by Ms. Gottling. The motion passed unanimously.**

60 **CONTINUED CASES:**

61 Two procedural matters were addressed by Chairman White. Firstly, an attendance sign-in sheet was
62 circulated for those present, ensuring that names were recorded for the record. Additionally, a second
63 sign-up sheet was provided for individuals interested in offering comments on the upcoming case. It was
64 mentioned that the sign-up list would be checked both in-person and online for those participating via
65 Zoom.

66 **CASE # SPR 23-03 PARCEL ID: 0104-0084-0000 DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND THE**
67 **CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 5,400 SF BOAT SHOWROOM. A NEW 33-SPACE PARKING LOT TO BE**
68 **CONSTRUCTED WITH A NEW WALKWAY TO COOPER ST.**

69 Will Davis introduced himself as the engineering representative for City Boat Company. He elaborated
70 on the three main aspects requested by the Board: building height, drainage design, and traffic study.
71 Regarding building height, the architect revised the floor-to-ridge height to meet zoning requirements at
72 24 feet, as detailed in the cover letter submitted the previous week. Mr. Davis also discussed the
73 updated drainage plan, outlining the chamber system under the parking lot and the sand filter for runoff
74 treatment. He emphasized that the existing culvert under Cooper Street would remain unchanged in
75 terms of capacity, with only the catch being replaced for improved functionality.

76 Mr. Davis then proceeded to discuss the third aspect, which involved communication with the
77 Department of Transportation (DOT). Mr. Davis mentioned that they had submitted a DOT driveway
78 permit and had met with a DOT reviewer on-site to go over the design criteria and site location. The
79 reviewer acknowledged the existing driveway and expressed satisfaction with the proposed changes,
80 including moving the driveway further from the intersection, improving visibility, and lowering the grade
81 on each side of the driveway. Mr. Davis emphasized that the proposed driveway design would adhere to
82 DOT's commercial entrance standards and positively impact stormwater management on the state
83 highway.

84 Mr. Davis continued to explain that DOT's review was ongoing and that they had confirmed through
85 follow-up communication that no traffic study would be required for the application. He pointed out
86 that the project was in full compliance with zoning regulations, with no variances or waivers being
87 requested.

88 Before the public comment session began, Mr. Davis expressed the company's enthusiasm to be part of
89 the community and their commitment to being good neighbors. He mentioned their deliberate choice to
90 acquire commercially zoned land to avoid rezoning complications. He emphasized their compliance with
91 zoning regulations and the intention to create a low-traffic impact commercial use. He highlighted that
92 while there had been discussions about the speed of traffic on Route 11, it wasn't within their control,
93 and their proposed use would likely have minimal traffic generation.

94 Mr. Claus asked about the potential traffic impact of various aspects of the business. The discussion
95 revolved around the use of the parking lot by patrons visiting the marina, the possibility of boat rentals,
96 and the integration of the parking lots. It was clarified that initially, there might be some patrons using
97 the parking lot for marina-related activities until the other site was developed. There was a suggestion
98 to inform the Department of Transportation (DOT) about this auxiliary use and potential traffic patterns.
99 The Board members also discussed the need for a traffic study, considering the nature of the proposed
100 activities and their potential impact on traffic.

101 The Board sought clarification on the estimated number of trips per hour, to which the Applicant
102 explained that it was an estimation and subject to change based on various factors. The importance of
103 considering traffic impact in the planning process was emphasized.

104 The Board members inquired about the number of offices within the proposed structure, specifically
105 mentioning the number of 12 offices.

106 The applicant clarified that there were several offices listed, but the actual number of people working in
107 the building would likely be limited to two or three individuals. They explained that they presented the
108 architect with a floor plan from another similar marina they had, which contained sales cubicles. The
109 applicant did not anticipate having a large number of offices in the new building.

110 The discussion then shifted to the other marina the applicant mentioned, which is both a showroom and
111 located by the water. The Board members questioned whether the 12 offices in that marina were
112 occupied by various services. The applicant confirmed that the offices in the other building had a mix of
113 roles, such as sales, food and beverage personnel, and a general manager.

114 Mr. Marquise raised a question about the Department of Transportation (DOT) permit, particularly in
115 relation to transitioning from a residential to a commercial setting. They expressed curiosity about how
116 DOT views such transitions, considering potential traffic impact and challenges related to sight distance
117 and intersections. The applicant acknowledged that DOT likely considers these factors during their
118 review, though specific details were not discussed.

119 Once more, the topic of submitting a third-party traffic study was brought up, echoing the previous
120 discussion during the earlier meeting on this case.

121 Mr. Clark inquired whether the applicant had discussed the use of the front of their parcel for parking
122 with nearby convenience store owners. Concern was raised about delivery trucks obstructing the
123 driveway. The applicant acknowledged the issue and indicated that they would address such concerns
124 once they occupied the site. They mentioned that it would not be acceptable for their driveway to be
125 obstructed by box trucks and that they would ensure proper access for their customers' safety.

126 The conversation continued with discussions about the building's architecture, elevation, and potential
127 steep slope considerations. Visual aids were referenced to provide further insights into the building's
128 layout and design.

129 During the public comment session, concerns were raised regarding several aspects of the proposed
130 development. One of the speakers from the public audience discussed the significance of the town's
131 master plan, which provides a vision for land use and development. The importance of maintaining the
132 rural character of Georges Mills and protecting water bodies such as Otter Brook, Otter Pond, and Lake
133 Sunapee was emphasized. The representative from the public audience urged the Planning Board to
134 consider the implications of approving a large showroom and extensive parking lot in the village, which
135 she believed would negatively impact the natural landscape in accordance with the current regulations.

136 Another speaker from the public audience addressed traffic safety concerns along Route 11 and the
137 impact on the local community. The dangerous nature of the road, with speeding vehicles and limited
138 sightlines, was highlighted. The potential risks to pedestrians, especially in the absence of sidewalks,
139 were emphasized. The placement of the proposed driveway on a blind curve was mentioned as a
140 potential hazard. The speaker expressed his worries about increased traffic and parking issues, as well as

141 the potential for unsafe parking practices, particularly due to the attractiveness of the area for boat
142 owners.

143 The potential effects on Otter Pond Brook were also discussed. The speaker noted that the brook is vital
144 for the annual smelt spawning run, which supports the landlocked salmon fishery. Concerns were raised
145 about the impact of construction on the brook during the spawning season, as well as potential runoff
146 and contamination from the proposed parking area. Questions were raised about the maintenance plan
147 for runoff control and filtering systems, particularly in the context of preserving water quality for the
148 smelt spawning run.

149 Overall, the speakers urged the Planning Board to carefully consider the potential consequences of the
150 proposed development on the village's character, traffic safety, and the health of local water bodies.
151 They highlighted the need to prioritize the goals and values expressed in the town's master plan and to
152 ensure that any development aligns with the community's vision for its future.

153 Referencing a Zoning Board meeting in March 2023, another representative from the public audience,
154 and the legal counsel of three representatives emphasized conditional approval of a special exception
155 for the project. This approval was contingent upon a traffic study being conducted and reviewed by the
156 Planning Board during the site plan review process. He emphasized that the Planning Board's order of a
157 traffic study was essential for the Zoning Board's conditional approval to become final.

158 He also then addressed several variances that he believed were required for the proposed development
159 to proceed. He pointed out that the project's building exceeded the front setback requirement outlined
160 in the zoning ordinance, necessitating a variance. Additionally, he noted that the steep slopes on the
161 property exceeded the allowed percentage, requiring a variance. Moreover, he argued that the
162 building's height exceeded the maximum permitted by the zoning ordinance and discussed calculations
163 supporting his assertion.

164 Concerning traffic safety, he mentioned issues related to sight distances, stopping distances, and
165 average travel speeds along Route 11. He highlighted the importance of a comprehensive traffic study to
166 accurately assess these factors.

167 While the stormwater runoff plan had been submitted that morning, he indicated that his engineer had
168 not yet reviewed it and would provide comments after a thorough examination.

169 Throughout his presentation, it was emphasized that his clients were not against development but had
170 legitimate concerns that needed to be addressed before the project could proceed. He also underscored
171 the necessity of adhering to the zoning board's conditional approval and the importance of ordering a
172 traffic study as required.

173 There were discussions regarding specific aspects of the proposed development. Mr. Davis mentioned
174 the inclusion of skylights in the design, noting that they appeared to extend beyond the predominant
175 roof line. The zoning ordinance was referenced, indicating that skylights could be added to non-
176 conforming buildings within certain limits.

177 The potential effects of the development on neighboring properties were emphasized. Concerns about
178 excessive lighting, noise, glare, and the impact on adjacent buildings, particularly apartment complexes,
179 were discussed. The removal of trees and the resulting increase in road noise were cited as additional
180 issues affecting residents' quality of life.

181 Cynthia Currier, a resident, and property owner, presented a letter outlining the concerns of her tenants
182 regarding various aspects of the proposed development. The letter pointed to specific articles and
183 sections of zoning regulations that the project might conflict with, including adequacy of safety, building
184 design, and protection against noise and glare.

185 Cynthia Currier's tenants emphasized the importance of preserving the quiet and peaceful environment
186 of their residential area. They shared their experiences with traffic hazards, the removal of trees, and
187 concerns about lighting impacting their daily lives. They also urged the Board to consider the potential
188 disturbance to archaeological relics on the property and suggested involving an archaeologist in the
189 development process.

190 Another resident, Doug Windsor, spoke about his familiarity with the area and the hazardous conditions
191 of the site's access points. He recounted personal experiences of navigating the dangerous intersection
192 and expressed agreement with previous speakers' concerns about safety and environmental impacts.

193 He pointed out instances of tree cutting occurring within 50 feet of Otter Brook, a fourth-order stream,
194 which they believed to be a violation of shoreland protection regulations. The omission of public
195 services and miscalculations could potentially impact their reports, particularly in relation to tree and
196 vegetation preservation requirements.

197 Expressing skepticism about the accuracy of engineering studies, Mr. Windsor urged the Planning Board
198 to demand higher standards. He emphasized the sensitivity and uniqueness of the proposed project
199 location, referring to it as an archaeological site. Drawing from a personal connection, he stressed the
200 historical significance of the site and its potential impact on development decisions.

201 Overall, the public comments highlighted a range of concerns, including traffic safety, lighting, noise,
202 preservation of natural features, and adherence to zoning regulations. Attendees urged the Board to
203 carefully consider these issues and exercise their authority to deny the project if necessary.

204 Gigi Polleys, a member of the public audience, highlighted the growing traffic and population trends in
205 the vicinity. She expressed concerns about the project's potential impact on these factors in the future.
206 She recommended that the Board carefully consider the town's Master Plan and the opinions of its
207 residents.

208 Larry Keane, a representative from the public audience raised points about the accuracy of the project's
209 plans and their adherence to zoning regulations. He questioned the discrepancy between the
210 application's description and the actual purpose of the proposed building. He expressed concerns about
211 the potential increase in traffic and the need for a proper traffic study.

212 Wendy Nolin inquired about the functionality of the proposed building, particularly the excess office
213 space. She questioned the need for such a large structure and expressed concerns about the impact on
214 the surrounding area.

215 Another speaker from the public audience quickly addressed a topic from a recent publication,
216 emphasizing changes in road maintenance practices. The new policy discouraged the use of sand for
217 traction during winter, favoring the use of chlorides or salts instead. The speaker expressed concerns
218 about this approach, particularly in relation to the local environment, specifically focusing on Otter Pond
219 Brook. Drawing from their experience with water systems, the speaker highlighted the potential
220 negative impacts of chlorides on lakes and streams. They pointed out that numerous lakes in New
221 Hampshire were already impaired due to high chloride levels. The speaker cautioned that even sand
222 filters, often employed to manage stormwater runoff, might inadvertently exacerbate the chloride issue.
223 They predicted that the slow dissolution of crystalline salt in these filters could contribute to the
224 ongoing problem. Particularly, they highlighted the potential consequences for Otter Pond Brook, a
225 small waterway that could see significant chloride runoff during rain events. He underscored the
226 importance of considering the timing of chloride application and its potential impact on aquatic life,
227 especially during crucial periods such as spawning seasons.

228 During the public session, a question was raised regarding the term “service writer”. It was explained
229 that a service writer is responsible for managing customer requests for boat repairs. They gather repair
230 details from customers and coordinate the servicing, which may occur at a different location. Despite
231 having a service writer, the current location does not allow boat servicing as per zoning restrictions. It
232 was also mentioned that a plan from another location was utilized for reference in the project.

233 Kirk Bishop provided a summary of the concerns expressed by previous speakers. He emphasized that
234 the proposed project seemed out of character for the rural setting of Georges Mills and could contribute
235 to environmental issues. He highlighted worries about increased traffic, stormwater runoff, and the
236 potential negative impact on the lakes and brooks in the area.

237 Amanda Slack from the public audience emphasized the importance of adhering to a no-wake zone and
238 questioned the feasibility of testing boats in such an area. She inquired about the impact of the project
239 on parking for town residents along Cooper Street.

240 Brenda Montagna raised her concerns during the meeting. Brenda inquired about the impact of the
241 proposed plan on parking for town residents along Cooper Street and another adjacent side street. She
242 required clarification on whether this parking would remain available if the project were approved.

243 Robert Montagna cautioned the Board about the challenges of addressing traffic issues on Route 11. He
244 cited ongoing disputes with state and town authorities regarding road safety and funding for
245 improvements.

246 Billie Barry expressed concerns about the traffic congestion he has observed on Route 11 over the years.
247 She remarked on the inadequate funding for road improvements and urged the board to consider the
248 potential impacts on the already challenging traffic situation.

249 Lisa Windsor shared her observations regarding recent flooding and run-off issues. She expressed her
250 worries about the proposed building's roof and its potential contribution to stormwater runoff. Ms.
251 Windsor also raised concerns about clear-cutting and the impact of tree removal on soil stability. She
252 questioned the adequacy of the current stormwater infrastructure and highlighted the potential adverse
253 effects of increased runoff on the lake and surrounding areas. She also raised concerns about the safety
254 of the crosswalk and the curve near the proposed site, as well as the size and purpose of the building
255 itself.

256 Lisa Windsor's comments focused on the potential consequences of increased traffic and runoff, as well
257 as the need for comprehensive and independent studies to address these concerns. She emphasized the
258 importance of addressing the reality of the situation, including traffic volume and safety hazards.

259 People were observed parking near the town boat launch area, consuming beverages, and utilizing
260 rental boats. Concerns were raised about the operational plans for the proposed business and its
261 potential impact on the location. Questions were posed regarding the necessity of 32 parking spots and
262 12 offices and whether these aspects aligned with the intentions of the project.

263 It emphasized the significance of conducting a thorough traffic study, particularly during peak summer
264 periods. The importance of obtaining independent information was stressed, as well as the need to
265 address safety and traffic concerns on Route 11.

266 Debbie Samalis, a business owner in the harbor, spoke about the changing dynamics in the community
267 due to the increased population and larger homes. She encouraged the board to consider the town's
268 master plan when evaluating the proposed project, focusing on the desired character and growth of the
269 area.

270 Elizabeth Whipple shared her concerns about traffic safety and accidents on Route 11. She emphasized
271 the need for a comprehensive traffic study conducted at various times and days throughout the
272 summer. Lighting concerns were raised, particularly regarding potential effects on avian and aquatic life
273 due to increased artificial light.

274 Overall, the attendees expressed a range of concerns related to traffic, safety, community character,
275 and environmental impacts, underscoring the importance of a comprehensive and thorough evaluation
276 of the proposed project.

277 Among the concerns raised during the meeting, one attendee from the public audience with experience
278 in construction and site work expressed apprehensions about the durability and effectiveness of a
279 specific construction material that allows water permeation. Drawing from years of experience, the
280 individual pointed out the potential drawbacks of this material, particularly in harsh weather conditions,
281 where it might not function as intended.

282 Another concern was voiced about the 15-inch culvert, which was deemed problematic due to its
283 potential to exacerbate flooding and road damage. The need for larger culverts to handle increased
284 stormwater runoff was emphasized, especially given the recent intensified weather patterns.

285 The highlight was the need for thorough and comprehensive long-term studies to address
286 environmental and runoff concerns. The individual stressed the importance of considering the broader
287 impact of projects beyond their immediate location.

288 Elizabeth Harper, representing the Lake Sunapee Protective Association, highlighted the significant
289 impact the project has already had on water quality due to clear-cutting and erosion on the steep slope.
290 She emphasized the critical role of the location within the watershed and the potential harm to the
291 ecosystem, including a rare species of smelt.

292 Skyler Hathorn, a former employee of a similar operation, recommended that the Board visit existing
293 locations of the company to gain a comprehensive understanding of their day-to-day operations. This
294 visit was suggested to provide a more informed perspective on the potential implications of the
295 proposed project.

296 Chairman White expressed appreciation for community participation, emphasizing the significance of
297 public input in their decision-making process. He highlighted the challenge of making informed choices
298 without adequate information and the importance of meeting zoning requirements.

299 The discrepancies between the presented building plans and the intended structure were also
300 discussed. The Board acknowledged that certain aspects, such as aesthetics, were beyond their
301 jurisdiction, and that the main focus was on adherence to zoning and regulations.

302 Regarding the matter of having a comprehensive procedure for gathering all necessary information prior
303 to the meeting to allow sufficient review time, the response indicated that some applicants provide
304 information at the last minute. Emphasis was placed on the importance of receiving a traffic study in a
305 timely manner.

306 As of the current evening, approximately 59 to 60 days have passed since the application was submitted,
307 and there remains a 65-day window within which the Board must reach a decision before their next
308 meeting.

309 The Board is faced with two possible courses of action. If members believe they possess sufficient
310 information to proceed, they may choose to grant approval. Conversely, if there is a sense that the
311 information is inadequate, they can opt to deny the application without prejudice. This would allow the
312 applicant to resubmit the same proposal in the future. Another option is to negotiate an extension of
313 the timeline in agreement with the applicant.

314 The question arose as to whether the Board could request the applicant to withdraw the current
315 proposal and then reapply.

316 Discussion turned to the specifics of the proposal, including potential considerations like addressing
317 steep slopes, obtaining required variances, making changes to the plan, and conducting a
318 comprehensive traffic study. Members expressed the view that the traffic study should ideally take
319 place during the summer months for a more accurate assessment.

320 The challenges faced by the Board in assessing the application and the desire for a more comprehensive
321 traffic study were key points of deliberation, especially given the changing seasons and potential
322 limitations of the data collected during winter. The fact that this was the second presentation of the
323 proposal added to the complexity of the decision-making process with much updated and revised
324 information some still being incomplete.

325 The Board deliberated on their options regarding the application. They mentioned the possibility of
326 approval, approval with conditions, denial, or denial without prejudice, which would allow the applicant
327 to resubmit with modifications. The need for a thorough traffic study during peak summer hours was
328 emphasized.

329 Concerns were raised about the stormwater runoff and environmental impact, prompting a suggestion
330 for an independent review. The Board considered the possibility of an extension requested by the
331 applicant.

332 In the end, the consensus seemed to lean toward denying the application without prejudice, given the
333 lack of essential information and unresolved concerns about traffic, stormwater management, state
334 permits, and the overall appropriateness of the proposed project for the location. The decision aimed to
335 allow the applicant to address the issues and potentially resubmit with more comprehensive data in the
336 future.

337 During the meeting, various board members shared their perspectives on the proposed project. Mr.
338 Peter White expressed uncertainty about the site's suitability and questioned if there might be a more
339 suitable location for the project. The proposal may not meet the necessary local requirements due to
340 factors such as soil conditions, road accessibility, absence of state permits, or inability to comply with
341 zoning regulations. The proposal does not fully address the valid concerns that were brought up,
342 including issues related to drainage, traffic, and health and safety.

343 The Board engaged in a discussion about the traffic issues and the need for a thorough traffic study
344 during peak summer hours. They also deliberated on concerns related to stormwater management and
345 the project's environmental impact. Some members voiced skepticism about the adequacy of the
346 proposed stormwater management plan. There was a consensus that the project's current proposal
347 might not be a good fit for the location.

348 **Mr. Clark made a motion to deny without prejudice Case # SPR 23-03 Parcel ID: 0104-0084-0000**
349 **Demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a new 5,400 SF boat showroom. A new 33-**
350 **space parking lot to be constructed with a new walkway to Cooper Street. Seconded by Ms. Gottling.**

351 **Ms. Saunders was appointed to vote instead of Mr. Osborne since he was not present.**

352 **Randy Clark voted in favor.**

353 **Jeff Claus voted in favor.**

354 **Robin Saunders voted against.**

355 Joe Butler voted against.

356 Peter White voted against.

357 Greg Swick voted against.

358 Sue Gottling voted in favor.

359 The motion failed.

360 Ms. Gottling made another motion to deny Case # SPR 23-03 Parcel ID: 0104-0084-0000 Demolition of
361 existing buildings and the construction of a new 5,400 SF boat showroom. A new 33-space parking lot
362 to be constructed with a new walkway to Cooper Street. Given that the applicant did not provide the
363 requested and required materials, reiterating the points raised during the reason for denial. The
364 motion was seconded by Ms. Saunders.

365 Randy Clark voted against.

366 Jeff Claus voted against.

367 Robin Saunders voted in favor.

368 Joe Butler voted in favor.

369 Peter White voted in favor.

370 Greg Swick voted in favor.

371 Sue Gottling voted in favor.

372 The motion passed.

373 The Board acknowledged that the applicant would need to address the issues raised before resubmitting
374 any proposal in the future. They thanked the community for their input and emphasized the importance
375 of finding a solution to the traffic and safety concerns in the area.

376 **CONSULTATIONS:**

377 **PARCEL ID: 0133-0035-0000 REMOVE PRE-EXISTING, NON-CONFORMING STRUCTURE AND REPLACE**
378 **WITH NEW STRUCTURE (3,200 - 4000 SQ FT). CHANGE OF USE: RETAIL TO RESTAURANT. INCREASE**
379 **BUILDING HEIGHT 10FT.**

380 In an informal meeting, an applicant who has not yet officially submitted any documents started a
381 discussion with the Board about their potential plans. The applicant presents drawings and ideas for a
382 new structure to replace an existing non-conforming building on Parcel ID 0133-0035-0000. The

383 proposed changes include converting the current retail space into a restaurant, increasing the building's
384 height by 10 feet, and altering the views. The location is along the Sunapee Harbor Riverway. The Board
385 provides feedback and expresses concerns, but no official vote is taken during this consultation. The
386 applicant is seeking guidance before investing time and resources into a formal application. There are
387 questions raised about zoning requirements, building height, setbacks, and parking. The Applicant raised
388 the issue of changing from retail to restaurant use and sought the board's interpretation of relevant
389 regulations. A discussion on parking ensues, with the Applicant providing parking calculations and
390 industry standards. The Board discusses the potential impact on parking demand in the harbor and
391 suggests options like designated parking spots for the restaurant. Concerns about the timeline for the
392 project and its effect on harbor operations are also addressed. The existing building's historical context
393 and construction details are examined, and the possibility of raising the building's height is discussed.
394 The consultation concludes with further exploration of the proposed building layout, including a
395 conceptual patio and public walkway.

396 In the ongoing discussion, the Board members deliberated the potential transformation of a historic
397 building within the harbor area. Concerns arose regarding the impact on parking availability and the
398 character of the community. Some members pointed out the need to prioritize parking, as different
399 businesses have different parking demands. The question of preserving the building's exterior aesthetics
400 was also raised, with suggestions of a blend between historical charm and modern design elements.

401 The potential plans included adding a restaurant with outdoor seating, which led to further discussions
402 about the challenges of parking and the potential increase in traffic. Some Board members shared their
403 experiences with parking studies in the past and emphasized the need for careful consideration of
404 parking demands.

405 There was also consideration of the impact on existing businesses in the harbor, particularly those
406 focused on retail. Concerns were voiced about the potential loss of retail spaces and the desire to
407 maintain a balance between restaurants and retail establishments.

408 The discussion touched on various aspects, including the timeline for construction, engineering
409 considerations, and the preservation of the building's historical significance. The proposed building
410 height and the possibility of adding a bar to the restaurant were also discussed, with potential
411 implications for parking and the overall atmosphere of the harbor.

412 Finally, Board members acknowledged the complexity of the situation and the various factors that
413 needed to be addressed. The importance of finding a balanced solution that respects the harbor's
414 unique charm while accommodating potential growth was emphasized.

415 The meeting continued with consultations related to other properties and their proposed changes,
416 including plans for office spaces and parking areas in an existing house. The Board recognized the
417 interconnectedness of these applications and continued their deliberations.

418 **PARCEL ID: 0232-0023-0000 UTILIZE EXISTING HOUSE AS OFFICE SPACE FOR 9 EMPLOYEES AND**
419 **ESTABLISH PARKING AREAS AND PARCEL ID: 0232-0018-0000 CHANGE CURRENT USE OF PROPERTY**

420 **FROM USE OF RESIDENTIAL TO COMMERCIAL USE FOR LANDSCAPING SHOP YARD AND CARPENTRY**
421 **SHOP. INCLUSIVE OF ONE DWELLING UNIT AND 15 EMPLOYEES.**

422 While categorized as distinct consultations, the subsequent two discussions are closely interconnected.
423 Although involving different properties, the consultations were conducted in a unified manner, treating
424 them as one.

425 A representative, referred to as Jim Bruss, presented plans for the utilization of an existing house
426 located at Parcel ID 0232, specifically 0023. The proposal involved converting the house into office space
427 for non-employees and making use of established parking areas. The property was situated near a
428 triangular corner lot and had an existing house with 720 square feet per floor. The Applicant, who
429 operated a landscaping and maintenance company, aimed to use the building as office space for
430 different divisions of their business.

431 Concerns were raised about noise levels and hours of operation, considering potential construction and
432 maintenance activities. The Applicant mentioned the need for parking due to their multiple employees
433 and the nature of their operations. Plans were also discussed for future expansions and additions on the
434 property, including the creation of a retention pond.

435 The Board members acknowledged the importance of landscaping to mitigate the visual impact of
436 parking areas and suggested incorporating greenery and trees to enhance the appearance of the site.
437 The applicant explained that their business primarily required in-and-out movement of vehicles and
438 employees, which influenced their parking needs.

439 Discussion shifted to the applicant's other property, identified as 46 depot road, which was acquired to
440 accommodate their growing business. The applicant had erected storage facilities and a construction
441 shop on this property. The Board members sought clarity on the parking arrangements and operations
442 between the two properties.

443 As the consultation came to closure, the applicant was advised that their proposals would require site
444 plan review due to the changes and expansions being considered. They were encouraged to submit
445 detailed plans, including landscaping designs and drainage studies, for further review. The applicant
446 emphasized their commitment to adhering to town regulations and expressed their willingness to work
447 with the board to address any concerns.

448 The meeting continued with discussions about future plans and the impact on the community, with
449 some Board members expressing curiosity about the applicant's current and planned employment
450 figures. The applicant clarified that the primary use of the property was for their business operations for
451 70 employees and not as a destination for clients or customers.

452 Finally, the Board thanked the Applicant for their presentation and indicated that further site plan
453 reviews and discussions would be necessary to address the various aspects of the proposals.

454 **MISCELLANEOUS:**

455 **REVIEW MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING(S):** There were no reviews of Minutes.

456 **OTHER BUSINESS:**

457 **Mr. Butler made a motion to adjourn at 11:12 PM. Seconded by Mr. Clark. The motion passed**
458 **unanimously.**

459 Respectfully submitted: Rajmonda Selimi

460 Panning Board

461 _____

462 Peter White, Chairman

Suzanne Gottling

463 _____

464 Gregory Swick

Robin Saunders

465 _____

466 Jeff Claus

Randy Clark

467 _____

468 Joseph Butler

Richard Osborne