

1 **Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes**  
2 **DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/MICROSOFT TEAMS**  
3 **February 28, 2024**

4  
5 **PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley (Vice-Chair),  
6 Erik Russell (Selectboard Representative), Phil Vermeer, Tim Jennings (Secretary), Brad Rich,  
7 Kurt Gotthardt (Alternate), Jim Bonner (Alternate and Videographer), Whitney Banker  
8 (Alternate)

9  
10 **PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** Linda Jones

11  
12 **STAFF PRESENT:** Rob Taylor- Land Use and Community Development Administrator,  
13 Whitney Banker-Recording Secretary

14  
15 **GUESTS:** Carl and Cari Lovejoy (via Teams), Lisa and Dick Drummond (via Teams), Affrille  
16 Degoma (via Teams), Lisa Ransom, Cameron Roberts, Phil Neily, Steve Whitman (Resilience  
17 Planning & Design, via Teams), Mark Fougere (Mark Fougere Planning & Development, via  
18 Teams), Kevin O'Reilly, Sara Roberts, Jay Boucher, Chris Ross (Pathways Consulting),  
19 Catherine Patch Parker

20  
21 **I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**

22 Chair Fracht called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and took attendance of members.

23  
24 Chair Fracht elevated Mr. Gotthardt to a voting member for tonight's hearings.

25  
26 **II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

27 Chair Fracht called for public comment for any items not on the agenda.

28  
29 With none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

30  
31 **III. HEARINGS**

32 **P24-02-03 Cameron and Sara Roberts – Minor Subdivision**

33 Chair Fracht read the case.

34  
35 Mr. Roberts shared that he and Ms. Roberts currently reside in the home at 804 Shaker Hill Road  
36 and are looking to subdivide the lot into two. They plan to build a house and have a hobby farm  
37 on the larger proposed lot.

38  
39 Mr. Taylor shared that the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) granted a request for variance  
40 relief from Enfield Zoning Ordinance, Article IV, section 401.2, paragraph K to subdivide a lot  
41 of less than 3 acres on September 12, 2023.

42  
43 Mr. Gotthardt wondered if the scaling measurements were off. Chair Fracht noted that they did  
44 seem off and reiterated that the Mylar map should be corrected.

45  
46 Ms. Degoma asked if the zoning would remain residential. Chair Fracht confirmed it would be.

47  
48 With no further questions or comments, Chair Fracht closed the public hearing.

49  
50 **Mr. Rich moved to discuss the application. Mr. Kiley seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of**  
51 **the motion (7-0).**

52  
53 With no further discussion, Chair Fracht moved on to the next motion.

54  
55 **Mr. Kiley moved to approve the subdivision as submitted. Mr. Rich seconded. Vote**  
56 **unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).**

57  
58 **P24-02-04 Tardiff Hall at Shaker Village, LLC Major Site Plan Review**

59 Chair Fracht read the case.

60  
61 Chair Fracht invited the applicant and his representative, Mr. Ross (Pathways Consulting, LLC),  
62 to explain which portion of the property will be proposed for the residential use of four units.

63 Mr. Ross explained that it was on the left side of the building from the midpoint, approximately  
64 1900sf per floor. The right side of the building will maintain its commercial use.

65  
66 Chair Fracht asked the board if they wished to ask that the application be modified to clarify that  
67 only part of the building was to be converted for residential use. Mr. Kiley suggested it be a  
68 condition of approval. Board members agreed.

69  
70 Mr. Ross explained the proposed changes. A new entry point at the west end of the building will  
71 be added for access to the residential units. The current central/east side entrance will maintain  
72 its function as the business entrance. Parking will be improved for the designated residential  
73 areas, with two spots per unit, along the southeast section of the building, along Chosen Vale  
74 Lane. Some places will be maintained for business use along the east end of the building, as well  
75 as the double-row lot and parking along the north side of the building. A loading dock along the  
76 northwest side will maintain its current function.

77  
78 New lighting will be added at entry points and along the parking areas. Additional plantings will  
79 be added to call better attention to entry/exit points. Tree cover is present along the southeastern  
80 side of the building and the north side. Loam, shade, mulch, and new deciduous trees are  
81 mentioned throughout the site plan.

82

*Enfield Planning Board Minutes, February 28, 2024*

83 Mr. Boucher is the business owner of Defiance Electric and property owner. Mr. Taylor said that  
84 the use change would likely reduce traffic that existed with full commercial use of the property.

85

86 Chair Fracht said that he is curious about the property's history. It is an R1 residential area, and  
87 he wondered when the building went to commercial use. Mr. Boucher and others have used the  
88 building for commercial use since 1986. Chair Fracht noted that the use was before zoning and,  
89 therefore, grandfathered.

90

91 Mr. Gotthardt said he did not see a symbol map on the plat and asked for a review of the symbols  
92 or a key.

93

94 Mr. Jennings asked if the lot was part of any homeowner's associations. Mr. Boucher said that  
95 the lot is part of the Lower Shaker Village Association and is on their municipal water system.

96

97 Each proposed housing unit is about 900 sf and has two bedrooms, two bathrooms, and a  
98 kitchen. The apartments will be in the Shaker Village style. The building will have sprinklers  
99 and upgraded energy, including heat pumps with backup heat.

100

101 Mr. Russell asked if the board needed to do anything regarding sewer hookup fees. Mr. Taylor  
102 said they would work with Mr. J. Taylor at the Department of Public Works (DPW).

103

104 Ms. Patch said that as an Enfield resident, she has worked with Defiance Electric and finds them  
105 easy to work with and fair partners in the community. She also echoed the need for housing in  
106 this area and supported their proposal.

107

108 Ms. Lovejoy asked if traffic between Chosen Vale and Caleb Dyer lanes could have a stop or  
109 yield sign added. Chair Fracht suggested this be brought to the homeowner's association if it is  
110 within that area. Mr. Boucher said there was a recent grounds committee meeting to address this  
111 with residents.

112

113 Ms. Lovejoy asked if renters would join the association. Mr. Boucher said he, as the property  
114 owner, is already part of the Lower Shaker Village Association. Mr. Jennings clarified that  
115 apartment residents would not be part of the association; only the lot owner would be.

116

117 Mr. Neily asked if calculations had been run on the sprinkler system for the water requirements.  
118 Mr. Boucher said that it is in the process right now. Mr. Neily said that he would like to see these  
119 once they are available. If the minimum flow for the sprinklers is not met, he believes there  
120 would be alternatives that could be discussed if needed.

121

122 Ms. Drummond said her home is directly across from Tardiff Hall and believes they are the most  
123 affected by the proposed change. They understand the need for housing and are on board with

*Enfield Planning Board Minutes, February 28, 2024*

124 this. She said that the new entrance for the residential units would be directly across from their  
125 home and stated concern about light pollution. Ms. Drummond and Mr. Drummond have lived at  
126 their home for 21 years and have never seen 50 cars in the parking lot of the building, even  
127 before COVID. She stated her concern that 2-bedroom units could result in 4+ people per unit,  
128 and residential use traffic would happen at all hours of the day (not just during business hours).  
129 She asked for clarification of the separate proposed entrance.

130

131 Mr. Ross explained that the new entry point is intended to support dividing the property between  
132 residential and business use. It uses existing stairwells on that side of the building to provide  
133 direct entry for residential functions. It also allows proper fire separation between the business  
134 and residential areas. Mr. Ross said there would be significant difficulty isolating staircases if  
135 they mixed the entrance for commercial and residential. The other staircase that could be used  
136 would pose challenges to restricting business and residential access areas and is less  
137 straightforward. Mr. Ross clarified that the new entry point is on the southwest corner of the  
138 building, with existing windows that will become the new entry point.

139

140 Mr. Ross said that he believed they could investigate more intense full-cutoff lighting and would  
141 be happy to adjust the lighting plans for entry and exit points. Mr. Ross also stated they will  
142 supply the proposed lighting details to the Drummonds. Mr. Ross also stated that they feel it is  
143 appropriate to add blinds that can be shut in the evening to all areas of the building. Mr. Ross  
144 recognized that the construction lighting currently being used is very bright, and if the  
145 construction lighting may also need to be adjusted, they can investigate doing this.

146

147 Mr. Ross said that the open-space note is regarding the area in general (open spaces throughout  
148 the village, such as walkable roads, play areas, etc.).

149

150 Mr. Ross agreed that traffic use patterns would be different from what they have been and would  
151 happen around the clock with residential use. He suggested that they could come up with  
152 rules/regulations for renters, including which entry points should be used for traffic to the  
153 building.

154

155 Ms. Drummond said that they remain concerned about the volume of traffic, headlights shining  
156 into their windows, etc. She also stated that she is unclear about the open spaces. She believed  
157 that those mentioned were part of the northern village. Chair Fracht stated that this would not be  
158 something that the Planning Board would regulate and that it should be discussed with the  
159 appropriate associations.

160

161 Mr. Boucher stated that he did not feel adding residential apartments would have any different  
162 impact on the community than building homes currently being done. Ms. Drummond asked if  
163 there would be restrictions on how many people could live in each unit. Mr. Boucher said that

Enfield Planning Board Minutes, February 28, 2024

164 they are only 900sf. Chair Fracht stated that multi-family use is allowed by right in the zoning  
165 ordinance for this district.

166

167 Ms. Drummond said that shifting the entrance for the residential units will significantly impact  
168 their home and would appreciate them reconsidering this. Mr. Boucher said that they cannot  
169 change this due to the location of the existing stairwell. Mr. Gotthardt noted that the zoning  
170 regulations and board also would be unable to restrict this.

171

172 Mr. Gotthardt asked about the preexisting exterior lighting. He stated that he believed that even  
173 grandfathered property lighting needs to be updated to full cutoff when there is a change of use.  
174 Mr. Boucher agreed they would be sure to reduce impacts and update all lighting.

175

176 With no further questions for comments from board members or the public, Chair Fracht closed  
177 the public hearing.

178

179 Motion to discuss – Vermeer

180 Second – Jennings

181 **Mr. Vermeer moved to discuss the application. Mr. Jennings seconded. Vote unanimous in**  
182 **favor of the motion (7-0).**

183

184 Mr. Jennings said there is an R1 district with a ¼-acre minimum lot size (since the lot is served  
185 by municipal sewer), and he wondered what determined the number of units that can be put in a  
186 building. The board has previously discussed this. Chair Fracht asked if this could be put aside  
187 for a later discussion and stick to direct questions about the application. Mr. Gotthardt clarified  
188 the lots in question are over 1 acre, so this would not be an issue for discussion tonight. Board  
189 members agreed with this clarification.

190

191 Chair Fracht reviewed the conditions of the board:

192 -add map symbol key to plat

193 -convert all exterior lights to full cutoff and provide a complete light plan

194 -include window treatments

195 -provide fire suppression sprinkler flow report for Chief Neily.

196

197 **Mr. Gotthardt moved to approve the application with the conditions stated. Mr. Vermeer**  
198 **seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).**

199

#### 200 IV. CONCEPTUALS

##### 201 Phil Neily – Enfield Fire Department Re: Lakeview Fire Protection

202 Chief Neily said that Lakeview had received a grant to upgrade its water system, which the town  
203 is not involved in. However, there are fire hydrants in the subdivision that he believed would  
204 have been approved by the Planning Board when it was initially created.

205

206 Chief Neily gave an overview of the fire hydrant locations and explained that the water lines  
207 were picking up bacteria that pose an issue if the hydrants are not regularly flushed. Lakeview  
208 has asked if the fire department has any problems moving from 2 lines to a single line. Chief  
209 Neily said he did not find any issue as long as the same volume of water was available. Mr.  
210 Kiley stated that the development would be pre-zoning. Board members felt this would not be  
211 something the board needed to weigh in on but understood the due diligence of the fire chief.

212

213 The project is in the final engineering phase. Chair Fracht said he believed the board could only  
214 say that if it has been engineered and approved, it is beyond its purview.

215

216 Mr. Russell suggested that the new system plan be appended to the site plan if there is one.

217

#### 218 **V. SELECTBOARD REPORT: Erik Russell**

219 The Selectboard's last meeting was a public hearing for SB2.

220

#### 221 **VI. LEGISLATIVE REPORT: David Fracht**

222 A proposed bill would add solid-waste management as a chapter to the master plan. This will go  
223 to the full house for a vote and will likely proceed to the Senate and governor.

224

225 A previously reported bill that would give planning boards quasi-judicial authority is likely to  
226 end at the committee level as a result of researching recent court cases. A hearing that requires  
227 notice means the board is already acting as a quasi-judicial body.

228

#### 229 **NH HOP GRANT DISCUSSION**

230 Mr. Whitman directed the board to the draft changes document he had provided for discussion.

231 Mr. Rich commented that he appreciated the document format; it was easy to understand and  
232 nicely laid out.

233

234 Mr. Jennings asked if the board should discuss potential overlay districts in the village versus  
235 combining them. He wanted to ensure the district list reflected what the town eventually wanted  
236 to have in the ordinance. Mr. Jennings also noted that the historic overlay district in Enfield  
237 Center should be added to the district list.

238

239 Mr. Jennings asked if overlay districts for Eastman, Shaker Village, and Enfield Center were  
240 something the board intended. Board members agreed that Eastman and Shaker Village would be  
241 overlays, to note that their respective boards. Members agreed that Enfield Center may not be an  
242 overlay. Regarding Shaker Village, the board discussed that they would be subject to the  
243 standard lake district requirements, and the overlay would be for the HOA, which is more  
244 restrictive.

245

*Enfield Planning Board Minutes, February 28, 2024*

246 Board members discussed the proposed rural district’s purpose and permitted uses. Members  
247 agreed that keeping permitted use open as “residential” was best. The consensus was that the  
248 land would restrict use (such as how many units wells and septic systems can serve).

249  
250 Concerns were raised about multi-family housing in the proposed Commercial/Industrial district  
251 and school bus access (particularly along the I89 corridor at exit 15; exit 16 already has  
252 Methodist Hill Road, which has a school bus route).

253  
254 Additional discussion took place to clarify questions for permitted uses of the districts and adjust  
255 language and instances of special exception.

256  
257 Mr. Whitman asked the board to consider whether they wanted the residential district to be more  
258 residential or to allow businesses (such as a daycare center) by conditional use permit rather than  
259 special exception. Conditional use permits are not appealable to the ZBA.

260  
261 Mr. Whitman and Mr. Fougere will send Mr. Taylor updated changes based on tonight’s  
262 discussion to share with the board.

263  
264 Mr. Fougere will review the proposed lines for the village district at tomorrow’s stakeholder  
265 meeting.

266  
267 Mr. Jennings asked the consultants to provide a list of land-use ordinance definitions they  
268 regularly use (such as commercial recreation). Mr. Whitman and Mr. Fougere each did not have  
269 specific lists but recommended an American Planning Association book with some definitions.

270  
271 Mr. Jennings asked for a modal zoning ordinance outline with headings to show formatting. Mr.  
272 Whitman said they typically work section by section. These vary by town.

273  
274 **LAND USE ADMINISTRATOR REPORT: Rob Taylor**

275 An application has been received for Laramie Farms for two variances (1 for height and 1 for  
276 buildings per lot). These will go to the ZBA’s meeting on March 12.

277  
278 A new developer has shown new interest in the 45-acre lot behind Pellerin Auto.

279  
280 The Town of Enfield's two site plan review applications will come to the next Planning Board  
281 meeting.

282  
283 **VIII. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: February 14, 2024**

284  
285 **Mr. Kiley moved to approve the February 14, 2024, minutes, as presented. Mr. Rich**  
286 **seconded. Vote in favor of the motion with two abstentions (5-0-2).**

287

288 **NEXT MEETING:** March 13, 2024

289

290 **ADJOURNMENT:**

291 **Mr. Kiley moved to adjourn. Mr. Rich seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-**

292 **0).**

293

294 The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 pm.