## MINUTES <u>Workshop Meeting</u> Sanbornton Planning Board

**Meeting Date and Time:** Thursday, October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020 at 7:00 PM

**Meeting Place:** Old Town Hall, 19 Meeting House Hill Rd + by Teleconference The meeting was called to order by Don Bormes at 7:00 PM

## **Roll Call**

Regular Members present: Will Ellis, Don Bormes, Selectman John Olmstead,

Alternate Members present: Thomas Lynch (seated in place of Jody Slack), Kalena

Graham

Others Present: Town Planning Assistant, Stephen Laurin

**Minutes of 9/17 -** Tom Lynch made a motion to approve the draft minutes of 9/17. Selectman Olmstead seconded the motion. Steve Laurin noted that abutter Mark Conley was in attendance at that meeting which should be noted. The motion passed unanimously.

## **Old Business**

**a.** Continued discussion of ADU ordinance – Steve provided a chart of other towns and what they allow in regards to Accessory Dwelling Units. In Canterbury a special exception is required by the ZBA and they do not allow a standalone ADU, it must be attached to a garage, shed, etc., and in Hollis you can have a standalone ADU but you must have twice the regular lot size. He noted that the Board had discussed standalone ADUs in the past and there seemed to be consensus that these should be allowed but only if there is more than the standard lot size.

Willie stated that he would like to allow for detached and standalone because people in Sanbornton are already doing that. Steve noted that in Hollis, an existing illegal ADU can be presented to the Town and if it meets the requirements then it's permitted. Chair Bormes stated that the current ordinance says only one dwelling is allowed per lot and that will need to be amended if the Board allows standalone ADUs. Kalena stated that there is already a provision for this in Sanbornton's ordinance; Article 4, Section X1.f states "An accessory apartment shall not be considered to be an additional dwelling for the purposes of satisfying the provisions of Section 4. F. of the Zoning Ordinance (otherwise referred to as the "one dwelling per lot" requirement)".

Andy stated that requiring shared electric supply, septic and driveway will allow for some control in regards to how far the ADU can be from the principle dwelling. Steve noted that the current ordinance does not say anything about septic systems for ADUs and would urge the Board to consider adding that language. He added that DES will not do a septic review for less than a two-bedroom dwelling. Will stated that he thinks the ordinance should just read that an "adequate" septic system is required and then the Health Officer can handle it. Tom suggested just stating that "any ADU must conform to state regulations". Kalena stated that the existing ordinance says ADUs "shall meet all applicable building codes and environmental regulations".

Steve stated that any homeowner can do their own electrical work in NH but asked if this would apply to an ADU. Kalena said she thinks it would if the homeowner is living in the principle dwelling. Andy asked if there is a consensus among members that they do want to allow for detached and standalone ADUs and there was. Tom asked if the Board would want to consider allowing a larger dwelling if it's a standalone unit rather than the 850 square foot limit that exists now for attached ADUs. Kalena stated that Laconia has a limit for ADUs which is 50% of the principle structure.

Willie stated that he thinks standalone ADUs should be allowed only if there is a minimum of 2 acres which would exclude these from the Recreation Zoning District where the minimum lot size is 1.5 acres. He noted that the ordinance for Madison is close to what he would like to see. Kalena also provided a draft of an ordinance to members through Steve via email to use as a starting point. Chair Bormes directed Steve to create a draft including the issues members raised tonight and using Madison's ordinance as a guide.

**b. Level I and II Home Occupation discussion** – Will stated that he thinks requesting a sign for a home occupation business should made it a Level II and therefore need a site plan, that is the only change he would make to the existing ordinance. Andy stated that he feels that this ordinance is making up for the fact that there are very few areas that allow commercial businesses in Sanbornton and allows for businesses in residential areas; his main concern is about added traffic and how that affects neighbors. Tom stated that when he had to come to the Board with his own proposal for metal fabrication out of his home he didn't find it to be an onerous task but the site plan requirements did look excessive for what he wanted to do. He also stated that traffic or added employees would be his main concern for a home occupation. Chair Bormes stated that Alton has a stipulation for "minor site plan review" versus regular site plan review which allows for hand-drawn plans, for example.

Steve noted that the Board discussed adding the word "manufacturing" into Leve II; Kalena stated that this would be defined as large machinery making goods but that doesn't appear to be the intent of Level II, she thinks that would just be considered commercial. Kalena and Andy agreed that they don't want to see signs for businesses all over town and were agreeable with requiring site plan review if you want to have a sign for your home business. Steve will work on a draft that includes this language for review.

## **Other Business**

**a.** Planner's Update – Steve received a boundary plan from surveyor Brian Bailey for Tax Map 11/Lot 59; this is just for notice to the Board and no action is needed.

**b. NE Solar Garden plans** – Steve has sent revised plans from NE Solar Garden to the Planning Board's engineer Kevin Leonard for review. They have also provided escrow. Kevin stated that he is very busy but will try to have preliminary notes back to Steve before the public hearing on October 15<sup>th</sup>. Chair Bormes suggested that Steve get a more firm answer from Kevin as to whether or not he will have his remarks back to Steve with several days for the members to review before the hearing, and members agreed that Steve should do this. Chair Bormes stated that if there is not adequate time to review he would consider asking the applicant if they would reschedule to a future meeting. Steve noted that Kevin has asked the applicant for a point-by-point response to his concerns and has not received this.

**c. NHMA webinar** – The Law Lecture meeting will be virtual and take place on Saturday October 31<sup>st</sup>, Steve will send information to members.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 15<sup>th</sup> at 7:00.

Respectfully submitted, Audry Barriault