

TOWN OF SUTTON

Pillsbury Memorial Hall

93 Main Street

Sutton /Mills, NH 03221

PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Draft Minuts for Tuesday August 27, 2024, at 7:00 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Teaster called the meeting to order at 7:01pm.

**ROLL:** Jason Teaster (Chair), Glenn Pogust (Selectmen’s Representative), Christine Fletcher, David Hill, Tim Wakeman (alternate), Chuck Bolduc

**ABSENT:** Roger Wells, David Burham, Kristin Angeli (alternate)

**ALSO PRESENT:** Michael Tardiff (CNHRPC); Maryann Simoni

Chair Teaster asked Tim Wakeman to sit in for Roger Wells, who was absent.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. **Review and sign final Mylar & Docs for Jeffrey’s Minor Subdivision.**

Peter said he attached the necessary conditional use permits, and noted that the shared driveway easement had been obtained and would be recorded with the Mylar. He noted that later on, a lot line adjustment will be brought forth for approval and may require some adjustment to the easement language as it has to do with the driveway and property access for both properties.

Peter believed all the requirements had been met for the conditions of approval. The mylar would be signed later in the week when it arrives at the Town Office.

**It was moved by David Hill and seconded by Jason Teaster to approve the mylar and sign it, throughout the week, so it can be recorded. The motion was approved unanimously.**

1. **Topic of next Master Plan review and public input session - CNHRPC.**

Mike Tardiff was present at the meeting from the Central NH Regional Planning Commission. Jason said he asked Mike to join the meeting because he wants to plan for the next public information session aimed at addressing issues raised in the Master Plan. He noted that there was a well-attended meeting on the question of “What is Rural,” and felt the next session could look into issues relating to housing.

Glenn recalled that a common complaint has been that people want their adult kids to be able to afford to live in Sutton, but they also don’t want anything to change to make this a possibility. Chair Teaster said it would be helpful to get some housing experts to come in and speak on the topic.

Jason also noted that the suggestion to create a “table of uses would be a worthwhile effort to focus on what people would like to see and what they would not like to see in the Town. Glenn said there are uses listed in the Special Exceptions for the Rural Agricultural district that people may not want anywhere in Town, but maybe there are additional possibilities for the Residential and/or the Rural Agricultural Districts that people would like to see.

Mike said he loves the idea of bringing people in to talk about the housing, etc. and what is going on in the State. Ben Frost does a good job with this type of thing. He felt like this was a great next step. Mike believes that the table of uses is key and there are some opportunities there that could be brought up at Town Meeting. The unused InvestNH grant money is still available and will support the Planning Board’s efforts through the next couple of Town Meetings.

Glenn thought it would be good to have examples of towns that have done some of the housing things that Sutton could also do, and show how it looks. Mike said the Town of Canterbury has done this and there are a variety of examples from that town and others that would illustrate the possibilities.

Mike said he could help track down some speakers for the next meeting. Christine said any ideas they come up with in the town must be backed up by the belief that there is a problem in the town. They found at the last town meeting that people didn’t feel that there was a problem. It may help to do the baseline of exposing people to why there actually IS a problem. Sutton cannot fix NH’s problem by itself but it can make a difference with its own little town. Mike said this is the same conversation they are having with a bunch of little towns. Chair Teaster said if they could outline the risks of not making any changes, it would help people understand that some changes must be made.

Peter said they have a limited amount of time; if they want to do this, they need to decide when and where, and pursue this actively. Their next meeting (September 24) doesn’t have a lot on the agenda. They will need to advertise and have some public notice if they expect to get the townspeople there. That Friday, they would need to submit a notice in the Intertown Record for the September 3rd issue, so the notice could come out in time. It was noted that if they want people to come, it has to be put in the Shopper.

Mike said he would find speakers and would mention the town of Temple, as Christine went to a workshop from NH Housing which highlighted that town.

David said they heard a lot of complaints from the citizens about not knowing about the master plan survey that was distributed during COVID. He wondered if they could repeat the survey somehow to get a bigger response from the citizens. Peter said most people probably get a lot of surveys already. Glenn said in November they will see more people than ever for the election. He suggested handing out postcards to everyone with a QR code to take a survey. Mike said in Warner they used the flashing traffic sign to tell people about a survey or meeting. He suggested using MetroQuest to do this (he feels it is better than Survey Monkey). It would only be six questions so people would be more likely to participate. Mike said he would work with his staff to generate questions and they could review them with the group at the October 8th meeting.

Mike said the Table of Uses conversation should be explored as well. A lot of other communities are working with this as well.

A public input session would be held September 24th with speakers from the State, which Mike would arrange. At the October 8th meeting they can work on the questions for the survey.

There was some discussion about which parts of this project would be covered by the grant.

**3. Domorack Merger – 89 Blaisdell Hill Road**

This is a merger for two lots of record: 4.81 acres and .13 acres (across the street from one another) and they will be merged to be one lot. The Planning Board has to approve this as it is the wish of the property owners.

**It was moved by David Hill and seconded by Glenn Pogust to approve the merger for the Domorack family.**

Glenn asked if there was only one residence on one of the properties. Peter confirmed this to be true. There was no residence on the .13-acre property.

**The motion was approved unanimously.**

**4.** **Start review of proposed Zoning changes.**

Peter went through some suggestions for possible changes to the Zoning Ordinance:

A. All they have for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) is a definition and nothing else. Peter showed an example of his suggested changes. This must be voted on and is required to pass by the State. The Town is not allowed to enforce the 750sq’ for a maximum size of an ADU because it goes against what the legislature has enacted.

B. Structure. The current definition captures almost everything. He is suggesting an expanded description that includes everyday exclusions. These are things that most people have in their yards but shouldn’t need to get a building permit for.

Glenn said that Peter suggested making these changes to the Select Board, who thought it was worthwhile. Peter said this came up as a result of a fire pit that someone constructed (half-way) on someone else’s property. They never got a permit and had they, this wouldn’t have happened. Christine said she didn’t like the inclusion of a walkway in someone’s back yard requiring a building permit. There was discussion about patios and retention walls. Peter said the list was just something to think about. They can decide to do whatever they want with it. Christine suggested putting some qualifiers on the hardscape items in the list. She didn’t think they should include things in the list that the Town isn’t able to monitor or enforce. It was thought that landscape features should be removed from the list. Glenn suggested allowing retaining walls of 4’ tall and under without a permit.

C. Storage Containers. Peter came up with a definition that captures containers, tractor trailer bodies with wheels, and similar containers. He would add an exclusion for a trailer that is registered and in condition for use on the road. Peter said this came from the Selectman.

Glenn said recently, a resident planned to have a storage container sit in the front yard of their home without limitation. Another situation having to do with this type of container is where a resident built some construction around two containers and then pulled the containers out and put them in the yard. The containers can be a component of a building, but it cannot sit outside of the building without a separate permit. Peter said this is just a clarification of a definition. They will then create the rule that goes along with the definition.

D. Temporary Use of Construction Containers. This includes travel trailers and storage containers. He has added the words “storage containers” to this rule, throughout.

E. Wetland Buffers. They have had a situation where a wetland buffer was used to satisfy a density requirement. The suggestion refers to table D-1. The table has had some things removed from it now, which were things previously allowed within the 75’ buffer from the wetlands. He added sheds, pavilions and gazebos to the table.

Peter said there is a non-resident who wants to regulate funnel development around the water. (When there is one spot on the water and a lot of people who don’t live there are allowed to use it). A petition will be coming forward from this person at their next meeting with regards to Blaisdell Lake.

**ADMINISTRATIVE:**

1. **Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes of the July 9, 2024.**

**It was moved by David Hill and seconded by Christine Fletcher to approve the minutes of July 9, 2024 as presented. The motion was approved unanimously.**

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS:**

Glenn shared that Peacock Hill still cannot yet get certificates of occupancy. The owner has been working with the State on an Alteration of Terrain permit and had to propose certain changes. His engineer is still in negotiations with the State. If he gets the Alteration of Terrain permit, he has to make all the changes according to the new plans accepted by the State. Then the Town will go out with their independent engineer to check things and new plans have to be provided “as built.” There were 36 trees cut down that were not supposed to be that have to be replaced. There need to be ownership documents for perpetual care of the features by the occupants of the homes. The owner should be creating a homeowner’s association and each member would pe bound by a declaration of covenants to maintain and inspect those features. There is still a lot that needs to be done before this project can obtain final approval from the Planning Board which is required before there cn be any certificates of occupancy.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 8:37pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recorder