

**LINCOLN PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2015 – 6:00PM  
LINCOLN TOWN HALL - 148 MAIN STREET, LINCOLN NH**

**APPROVED**

**Present:** Chairman Jim Spanos, OJ Robinson - Selectmen's Representative, John Hettinger, Ron Beard (alternate & Fire Chief), Taylor Beaudin (alternate),

**Members Excused:** Vice-Chairman R. Patrick Romprey, Paula Strickon, Callum Grant (alternate), Norman Belanger (alternate)

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Town Manager and Town Planner Alfred "Butch" Burbank, Planning and Zoning Administrator Carole Bont, and Wendy Tanner (recorder)

**Guests:**

- **Dennis Ducharme**, Managing Member of RiverWalk at Loon Mountain, LLC, at 33 Brookline Road, Lincoln, NH 03251, and RRP (Registered Resort Professional), President of Inn Seasons Resorts 212 Mid Tech Drive, West Yarmouth, MA 02673, including Inn Seasons at South Mountain and Inn Seasons at Pollard Brook.
- **Mike LeClerc**, resident of 357 US Route 3, Lincoln, NH, and neighbor to other property owned by the owners of the Rodeway Inn (previously The Red Doors Motel).

- I. CALL TO ORDER** by the Chairman of Planning Board; announcement of excused absences, if any, and seating of alternates(s), if necessary.

*The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.*

**II. CONSIDERATION** of meeting minutes from:

- July 22, 2015
- August 12, 2015

**Motion to approve the minutes of July 22, 2015**

**Motion:** John Hettinger    **Second:** OJ Robinson

**All in Favor: (3-0)**

*Ron Beard was seated for the voting of the minutes for August 12*

**Motion to approve the minutes of August 12, 2015**

**Motion:** John Hettinger    **Second:** Ron Beard

**All in Favor: (3-0)**

*Ron Beard and Taylor Beaudin are seated.*

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **6:00 PM –Update** – Dennis M. Ducharme, President of InnSeasons Resorts – South Mountain Resort on land owned by Southern Peaks Development, LLC, BlueGreen Corporation, 4960 Conference Way No. #100, Boca Raton, FL 33431 – to discuss minor changes in the configuration of units within the already approved Phase II addition at 23 InnSeasons Drive in the Village Center (VC) Zone – i.e., making some units 2 bedroom units instead of 1 bedroom units.

Ducharme explained that in 2013 the Planning Board approved the Phase I and Phase II additions for a specific building and unit configuration. Ducharme built Phase I with twenty three (23) units in the building. On April 22, 2015, the Planning Board approved the six (6) extra units in the basement of the two phases. On May 6, 2015, the Zoning Board of Adjustment approved five (5) floors of living space (versus 4 floors) to accommodate those six (6) extra units in the basement of the two phases.

When Ducharme reviewed the economics of the Phase II addition, he took what he learned from selling Phase I – that the larger and more expensive units are the most popular with his purchasers or the general public. Ducharme asked his architects if they could reconfigure the building to add more Presidential suites and two bedroom units and remove some of the studio and one bed room units. The architect did.

Originally Phase II was going to be comprised of forty three (43) condominium units; it is now changed to thirty four (34) units in the same footprint. There will be more bedrooms in the Phase II building and a few more bathrooms, but fewer kitchens. Ducharme reminded the Planning Board that the building still occupies the same footprint; it is in the same location and has the same height. Only the inside configuration is changing.

The parking plan included adequate parking spaces for the Phase II forty-three (43) units. There were 162 parking spaces for both Phases. [The Land Use Plan Ordinance requires two (2) spaces for each residential unit (includes dwellings, timeshare units, quarter share units or other similar types of occupancy.)] Ducharme explained that they would be keeping the extra parking spaces even though there would now be nine (9) fewer units. There are now six (6) presidential units on the top floor instead of two (2) as shown on the original plan. The rest of the units will be two (2) bedroom units instead of one (1) bedroom units. Ducharme said that the larger units are selling better. Ducharme said that although it is contrary to the economic principle that “the more units, the more money you make”, fewer larger units is the better economic model in this case. In his market, it is more profitable to sell a larger unit than several smaller units. The economic analysts told Ducharme that the project will sell much faster with larger units. Ducharme also told the Board that the Phase I units were sold out already. Ducharme said that the same principle is true for the RiverWalk building; the larger units are selling much faster than the smaller units.

Hettinger asked if these were all time share units. Ducharme said that this building is in the Blue Green Vacation Club and they are under contract with the Blue Green Vacation Club to sell these units. [BlueGreen Corporation sells vacation timeshares.]

Ducharme said that they have broken ground and started the site work. Most of the bad material (mostly ash) from this area is being taken to Merrimack, New Hampshire, by Waste Management.

Ducharme assured the Planning Board that he would get Planning & Zoning Administrator Bont a revised set of plans that will show the exact layout with all the bedrooms and bathrooms for each unit so that the proper water, sewer and bedroom fees can be assessed. Ducharme said that the engineers were still in the reconfiguration stage and should be done with the new plans by Friday, August 28 or Monday August 31. Ducharme offered to pay estimated water and sewer tap fees up front. Ducharme felt that the water, sewer and bedroom fees could be upwards of \$100,000 although he did not know for certain.

Chair Spanos asked if Ducharme would be submitting “as built” plans to Bont.

Bont said they would not be “as built” plans yet. Bont said that she had spoken with Ducharme earlier and will receive the revised plans for figuring the right fees. Bont said that the items that would concern the Planning Board at the site, like lighting and parking, were not changing.

Ducharme said that the exterior of the building would not be changing. Even though there will be less units, the number of parking spaces will remain the same.

Fire Chief Beard asked about whether the updated plans would include changes to the sprinkler system. Ducharme said that the configuration of the sprinkler system would be different from configuration shown on the original plans, but should be reflected in the new plans from the engineers.

Chair Spanos asked about the exterior of the building.

Ducharme said that the exterior of the building would not be changing. Ducharme said that the only thing that would be changing on the inside was the floating shear walls.

**Shear wall:** In building construction, a rigid vertical diaphragm capable of transferring lateral forces from exterior walls, floors, and roofs to the ground foundation in a direction parallel to their planes. Examples are the reinforced-concrete wall or vertical truss. Lateral forces caused by wind, earthquake, and uneven settlement loads, in addition to the weight of structure and occupants, create powerful twisting (torsional) forces. These forces can literally tear (shear) a building apart. Reinforcing a frame by attaching or placing a rigid wall inside it maintains the shape of the frame and prevents rotation at the joints. Shear walls are especially important in high-rise buildings subject to lateral wind and seismic forces.

Encyclopedia Britannica

Fire Chief Beard said that if Ducharme is changing the compartments, fire dampers would have to change too. Ducharme said that his engineers were working on making those types of changes now.

Ducharme said that although it will cost him quite a bit of money to reengineer the entire building, the economics were so good it would pay for him to reconfigure the building. Ducharme believes the new plan will create a better flow within the building; it will not be as congested.

Bont said that Ducharme came to her with information to start the process of obtaining the Land Use Permit. She has everything required from Ducharme except the final plan; they are waiting for the plan from the engineers.

Ducharme said that if this was Florida they wouldn't care so much, but because it is New England, they want to get the foundation in before winter.

Members of the Planning Board discussed the changes and explained to Ducharme that since there are no physical changes to the structure other than the number of rooms and that number is going down, that there are no additional approvals required from the Planning Board. However, a copy of the final plans from the engineers needs to be given to Bont to ensure that the proper water and sewer tap fees and bedroom impact fees are paid.

*Ducharme thanked the Planning Board and left the meeting.*

**B. 6:00 PM – Voluntary Lot Merger** – Wilfred A. Ledger, Jr., of 6400 Eagle Ridge Drive, Vallejo, CA 94591 owns two adjacent “garden lots” on Maple Street and has applied to merge the two lots:

1. Map 117, Lot 029 LO Maple Street Garden Lot #221G
2. Map 117, Lot 030 LO Maple Street Garden Lot #223G

Bont explained that Ledger purchased two garden lots and would like to merge them. Originally Ledger thought he could put a structure on this lot if he merged them, but Bont explained to Ledger that even merged the lots are still not big enough for a structure. Bont said that Ledger still wants to merge the lots because his overall property assessment will go down if he merges them.

Town Manager/Planner Burbank said that these lots were originally set up for small household gardens.

Bont said that J.P. Henry (the owner of the paper mill) set up the residential village part of town across from the paper mill. Some of the residential lots he created on the southwest side of Maple Street were not long enough to have a garden in the back so instead of making all of the lots longer he put little garden lots for the short lots behind the longer lots on the other side of Maple Street. For the owners of the short lots on Maple Street to access their garden lots behind the longer lots on Maple Street, he created rights-of-way for the short lots over the longer lots located across the street.

Bont said that the people in the short lots originally owned the garden lots behind the



longer lots, but over time owners of the short lots sold off their garden lots; the garden lots became separated from their original short lots. For example, Pat Romprey purchased a few of these garden lots that abut his property and then he merged them with his house lot. Ledger is only merging two garden lots together.

**Motion to approve the merge of Maple Street Garden lot 221G, M117-L029 and Garden lot 223B, M117-L030.**

**Motion: John Hettinger     Second: Taylor Beaudin**

**All in Favor: (5-0)**

C. **6:00 PM – Conceptual** – Falguni Patel on behalf of the Kushi Corporation, owner of property located on 417 US Route 3 (Tax Map 106, Lot 017) with the business called the Rodeway Inn (formerly the Red Door Motel), would like to discuss the possibility of putting employee housing on her property in the form of one or two manufactured homes on slabs behind the motel to house her own employees. Kushi Corporation has a total of 31 motel units in two separate buildings, including the owners' unit. The lot is 3.5 acres and is located in the General Use (GU) Zone. For the General Use Zone the maximum percentage of lot coverage is 70%. "Lot coverage" shall include the buildings, out buildings, roads, parking area (paved or unpaved) and swimming pools or other non-permeable recreational facilities. Treed islands within parking areas shall be excluded from this area.

*Although Falguni Patel was informed of the date of the meeting, she did not attend the meeting.*

Bont explained that Falguni Patel proposed to install two "slab houses" in the back of the lot for her workforce housing. (By "slab houses" Patel means manufactured homes built on a cement pad or slab.)

This property is located in the General Use (GU) District. If Patel were adding additional units to the hotel the Planning Board would look to how much of the lot is covered with impervious surfaces. According to the Land Use Plan Ordinance (LUPO), the maximum percentage of lot coverage is 70% in the GU District. Bont added up all of the impervious surfaces as indicated on the property assessment card, and calculated that about 21% percent of the lot is covered in impervious surfaces. If Patel adds more units to the motel itself, the controlling factor would be the maximum lot coverage of 70%.

On the other hand, Patel is inquiring about adding one or two dwelling units. Under LUPO, the minimum lot size per dwelling unit is 15,000 square feet per unit or (0.344 Acres) a little more than one third of an acre. One of the questions for the Planning Board to consider is how to treat this lot because part of the lot would be a motel and another part of the lot would be a manufactured home. Bont could not find in the ordinances where one parcel or lot is required per dwelling unit.

Chair Spanos suggested that if the Planning Board removed 30,000 square feet (for potentially two dwelling units @ 15,000 square feet per unit) from the lot, they could possibly treat the rest of the lot as a motel; Patel would still have less than 70% coverage.

(3.5 Acres X 43,560 sq. ft. per Acre = 152,460 square feet.  
152,460 sq. ft. – 30,000 sq. ft. = 122,460 sq. ft. or  
2.81 Acres left over after removing land to support two dwelling units)

Bont asked if then Patel would be forced to sub-divide the two lots off of the motel lot to support two dwelling units. Bont said that she did not find anything in the current ordinances to address this issue. Perhaps members of the Planning Board would know of other limitations that she could not find. The Site Plan Review Regulations, Article IV Definitions, anticipates the conversion of lots from residential to nonresidential use, but not the other way around. Patel would need to come for Site Plan Review approval for adding more than 500 square feet of floor area or impermeable surface to an existing nonresidential use, but what standards would need to be met?

**DEVELOPMENT:** The construction or improvements on a tract or tracts of land for nonresidential use or use for multi-family units other than one and two family dwellings. For purposes of these regulations the word “development” includes a “change or expansion of use” as defined below.

**CHANGE OR EXPANSION OF USE:** (a) The conversion of any lot, parcel or building, or portion thereof, from a residential use to a nonresidential or multi-family use; (b) The addition of more than 500 square feet of floor area or other impermeable surface to an existing nonresidential or multi-family use; (c) The addition of less than 500 square feet of floor area or other impermeable surface to an existing nonresidential or multi-family use, if constructed within 3 years of any prior construction on the same lot or parcel; (d) A change of use from one category of permitted or special exception use, as listed in the land use schedule of Article VI of the Lincoln Land Use Plan Ordinance, to another such category of listed use, regardless of whether the change involves construction; and (e) Any material change to a previously-approved site plan, or series of changes over a 3-year period resulting cumulatively in a material change, as determined by the Planning Board Chair and Town Planner.

Town Manager Burbank said that this creates an interesting issue and if the idea caught on could become a problem. Chair Spanos said that, if allowed, this scenario would be repeated all over town.

Robinson said that Patels do have enough land area required for two dwelling units and the ordinance says the minimum lot size for a dwelling unit is 15,000 square feet; the ordinance does not say 15,000 square feet on a “sub-divided lot”, it says 15,000 square feet. Robinson said that if they have enough land then Patel would not have to sub-divide the lot, but that 15,000 square feet would have to be reserved out for holding (or supporting) that single family house.

Bont said that if the Town does not require the dwelling units be on separate subdivided lots, the Town would need to create a means for tracking the un-subdivided lots or land supporting these dwelling units. Brainstorming, Bont, said perhaps Patel would need a

surveyor who could spot the dwelling or home onto a 15,000 square foot lot (kind of like a planned unit development). The surveyor would use dotted lines to show the outline of the lot; the surveyor would not use solid lines because there is no sub-division. Perhaps the Patels could have two dwelling unit lots but then Town would not be able to count those lots. What happens if the Patels install two dwelling units and then they want to pave the rest of the lot? Beaudin said that they cannot go over 70% coverage. Bont said that you could then say they have to remove one of the homes if you want to add 4 more units to the motel.

For the General Use Zone the maximum percentage of lot coverage is 70%. "Lot coverage" shall include the buildings, out buildings, roads, parking area (paved or unpaved) and swimming pools or other non-permeable recreational facilities. Treed islands within parking areas shall be excluded from this area.

Beaudin asked if property owners are allowed to have more than one dwelling on a lot. Chair Spanos said that many of the hotels on US Route 3 also have residences on the same lot. For example, the owners of Riverbank Motel built a house for their mother.

Town Manager Burbank said to think about the people who will want to cluster everything into a small space, but that a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet is "on the books" for a reason. People will then want to build on smaller lots.

Bont said that the Planning Board is currently working on the Master Plan update. As part of that process, the Planning Board will look at the town ordinances. Bont said that perhaps the Planning Board members would decide that they want the General Use zone along parts of NH Route 112 to stay the same, but would consider having a second type of General Use District that would increase the residential density along US Route 3. Bont explained that there is currently a workforce housing problem in town. Currently available apartments are too expensive for the average service worker to rent in order to live within a reasonable distance from his/her job. Bont said that this is not just a Town of Lincoln problem, but a problem in most tourist-driven towns.

Town Manager Burbank said that is exactly the problem that has prompted Patel to come into the Planning Board with this request.

Bont said this is a perfect example as to what the Planning Board should be thinking about; how does the Town address that problem. If the Planning Board updates the Master Plan based on what the townspeople want and need (as indicated from looking at the surveys), then maybe the Planning Board could think about changing the zoning ordinance in time for Town Meeting next year.

Hettinger said if we allow housing development to get too dense with some of these homes, our nice tourist town will not be so nice anymore.

Chair Spanos asked what the frontage for the property is on Hanson Farm Road. [The frontage of Map 105, Lot 017 is 495 feet.]

Robinson said that Patel has plenty of room; Patel could subdivide. Robinson said that if you look at Patel's situation from a lot coverage perspective, unless Patel is building 10,000 square foot houses, Patel would be way under the lot coverage ratio. Does the Planning Board make her sub-divide? Two dwelling units would fit in lot-coverage wise. Is a house rental unit a different category than a lodging rental unit that would demand site plan review?

Bont said that if you look at Map 105, Lots 018 and Lot 019 just north of Map 105, Lot 017 (Kushi Corporation) both lots are 0.36 acres each. (15,000 square feet is 0.344 Acres.) If you want to see how much land two dwelling units would take up on Lot 017, you are talking about putting a mobile home on a lot approximately the same size as those two lots. The two mobile homes and their supporting land would be situated in the back of the lot, fronting on Hanson Farm Road. You would need to have some kind of layout to show where the land is supporting each of the dwelling units.

Town Manager Burbank said that he understood that the Patels were going to put the mobile homes on slabs, so they would not be moving the mobile homes around on the lot. Beaudin explained that US Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that manufactured homes be put on slabs with hurricane tie downs.

Bont said that if Patel knew where she was going to put the manufactured homes the Planning Board could assign 15,000 square feet somewhere on the back of the lot. She would be meeting the minimum lot requirement for dwelling units.

Town Manager Burbank said that Patel would have to show what she has for available space. Chair Spanos said that if Patel came in for site plan review, her site plan would show that.

Beaudin asked, "without subdividing?" Town Manager Burbank said that according to what Bont read in the ordinance it is not clear that Patel would need a subdivision.

Chair Spanos asked if we had anything for a mobile home park as far as density. Bont said Patel had not looked at the proposal that way. She would have to look at the Land Use Plan Ordinance, the Site Plan Review Regulations and the Subdivision Regulations again with that in mind.

Robinson said that if Patel designed it as a mobile home park then she have to go back to multi-use because the other half of the lot is clearly a motel. Robinson said it is either a motel with residential or a motel with mobile homes.

Beaudin said, "It could turn into a mobile home park if there is no ordinance."

Hettinger said she could convert the motel into a multi-family facility. Town Manager Burbank said that could happen, but then she would need 15,000 square feet per dwelling unit.



Fire Chief Beard asked if Patel had plans. Bont said this is a “conceptual”; the Planning Board does not need plans for a conceptual. Robinson said that the Planning Board does not make decisions on a conceptual.

Robinson said that 15,000 square feet would be reserved for holding the single family residence. If Patel comes in and wants to put in three more mobile homes, Patel would need to go through full site plan review for converting use of the land to a mobile home park. If Patel wants to put in more motel units, she would have to show that she has enough parking without exceeding the 70% coverage ratio using what is left after subtracting the 15,000 square feet for each mobile home Patel has in the back. Either way Patel would need to come back in for site plan review. It cannot morph into anything without following whatever rules are in place at the time. If Patel waits 5 years to do something, the rules might be different in 5 years.

Chair Spanos said that Patel needs to come in for Site Plan Review for the two homes and the Planning Board could allocate the space. Chair Spanos felt that a line would not need to be drawn, but that 30,000 square feet (15,000 square feet per home) would need to be “drawn off” and then calculate the impervious surface of the hotel part to determine the percentage of coverage.

Bont said that part of that discussion should be where are the driveways going to be; will the driveways come off Hanson Farm Road?

Robinson said if the driveways are paved, then the driveways become additional impervious surfaces. The space that the house takes up is also an impervious surface. If the surveyor drew a dotted line around the land designated to support the dwelling to reserve the space (not meant as permanent lines) and if later Patel wanted to come in and put a shed there, the line could be moved. The line should not be permanent as long as there is 15,000 square feet around each dwelling. It should not matter to the Planning Board where the lines are as long as there is 15,000 square feet per dwelling reserved.

Beaudin asked if more than one dwelling was allowed on a single lot if the lot is in the General Use (GU) District. Town Manager Burbank said that as long as there is 15,000 square feet per dwelling, yes. Bont said that there are quite a few lots in town now that have more than one residential unit on them.

Chair Spanos polled the Planning Board to see if there was an agreement that Patel would need to come in for Site Plan Review. Hettinger said that he would like to see plans first. Robinson said that Patel needs to come in for Site Plan Review delineating the space for each lot. Beaudin agreed.

*Although this was a Conceptual, public input was allowed.*

Mike LeClerc asked how many employees the Patels (Kushi Corporation) had at the Rodeway Motel; he did not think the motel was that large. He asked whether the Patels

were doing this for the future – to house other foreign kids that come in to work here in town. LeClerc did not think the resort was large enough to have to house employees.

Fire Chief Beard said he thought the Patels owned other businesses on other properties and were looking to house employees for those businesses as well. LeClerc said he was not sure the Planning Board should want to take that into consideration. Hettinger said that maybe Patel is not looking at employees for her business, but for other businesses as well.

The Planning Board determined that Patel would need to come in for Site Plan Review.

**D. 6:00 PM – Conceptual** – Orrin J. Robinson & Randall R. Thomas own a house at 83 Hanson Farm Road (Tax Map 105, Lot 026) built a 3-family house in 2001. They live in the main part of the house. There is one rental unit on the lower level, and a second rental unit over the garage. They would like to discuss the possibility of making two changes to their property:

1. Re-configure the lower level to make an additional rental unit. This would not require any outside changes to the building.
2. Place a 350 sf. caboose on our property to be used as a rental unit. This would have a deck in addition to the 350 sf living space. They would put in a second driveway with parking for this unit. This will be positioned within the required setbacks.

This would change their property from a 3-unit multi-family to a 5-unit multi-family. Their property is in the General Use (GU) Zone. Do they need Site Plan approval for this proposed change? Or will they need just a Land Use Permit?

*The application was withdrawn by the applicant.*

#### **IV. CONTINUING AND OTHER BUSINESS** (Staff and Planning Board Member/Alternates).

##### **One Love Brewery**

Town Manager Burbank said that the Woodstock water and sewer system is taking a big hit from the Woodstock Brewery; the Woodstock Brewery's use of the Town of Woodstock water and sewer system is causing large issues. After learning about the problems in Woodstock, Burbank and Public Works Director met with One Love Brewery. One Love Brewery will be in better shape because One Love Brewery's system is much smaller and he does not physically have the space to grow to the size of Woodstock Brewery. During the water conversation, they talked about One Love Brewery's Phase I and Phase II, with Phase I being the restaurant and Phase II being the brewery. Bont and Town Manager Burbank both remembered that Michael Snyder of One Love Brewery needed to come back in for Site Plan Review for Phase II. Snyder believes that he is all set and that he does not have to come back in for the Planning Board Site Plan Review approval for Phase II. Snyder felt he was all approved for both Phases.

Bont said that the information is in the packet that shows the water and sewage and the amounts that would be involved. The Certificate of Land Use Compliance which approved the restaurant

phase. Bont thought that Snyder did not need to come for site plan review for the restaurant Phase I. Bont said that as they started to ask questions about the brewing Phase II, it was her impression that Phase I was only the restaurant. Bont remembers Snyder saying “this is Phase I and we only want to get the restaurant off the ground first”. When we looked at the minutes, it is not clear what we were expecting them to do. Was he supposed to come back for Site Plan Approval for Phase II – the brewery?

Chair Spanos said that he remembered that because the space to be used for One Love Brewery was formerly a restaurant (the former Fratello’s Restaurant) Snyder did not need to come before the Planning Board to open another restaurant in the same space.

Hettinger said that he distinctly remembers that Snyder said they were putting the barrels in the kitchen, the old kitchen.

Fire Chief Beard said that while performing “a walk through” with Snyder, he learned that Snyder was going to have to remove all of the old infrastructure that was above the kitchen because his barrels would not fit, so he moved the brewery to the old restaurant.

Hettinger said that this is a big change from the plans Snyder originally told the Planning Board about.

Fire Chief Beard said that when he did the “fire safety walk through”, he saw the back of the restaurant and asked what was going on there. Fire Chief Beard said that the back of the restaurant was not part of the first walk through he had done with Snyder.

Bont said that the only contact the Planning Board had with Snyder was a “Conceptual”, not a properly noticed Site Plan Review hearing. During the “Conceptual” review Snyder asked if he would be required to do a Site Plan Review. Bont thought that the Planning Board decided that Snyder did not require Site Plan Review for Phase I with the restaurant, but she was not sure about Phase II with the Brewery.

Chair Spanos said that in his opinion that Snyder did not need to come back in for site Plan Review for the brewery either. Chair Spanos felt that Snyder was just reconfiguring the brewery into the restaurant.

Town Manager Burbank said that Snyder is of the opinion that he did not need to come back in for Site Plan Review, but Burbank wanted to make sure by asking the Planning Board.

Beaudin was not here for the meeting. Fire Chief Beard was not on board then. The Planning Board members decided that they would review the notes put together by Bont and the Board would reviewed this matter at the next Planning Board meeting.

### **North Country Council Dinner**

Bont asked if anyone was interested in going to the dinner at the Mountain View Grand Hotel.

There was a brief discussion about the event.

### **Environmental Impact of the Northern Pass**

The Northern Pass Project is the new proposed high-voltage transmission line with eighty foot (80') high steel lattice pylons connecting the hydro-power network of Quebec Canada 187 miles through New Hampshire to the population centers in the southern New England electric market. The owner of the project is "Northern Pass Transmission LLC" (aka "Northern Pass" or "Hydro-Quebec"). Bont explained that Northern Pass is planning to bury the Northern Pass transmission lines from Bethlehem to Plymouth, but that the rest of the transmission line north of Bethlehem and south of Plymouth will be above ground.

Hettinger asked if the transmission line would be buried under federal highways like US Interstate Route 93. Although burial of lines beneath State and Federal Highways is the general plan, OJ said that he understood that the Northern Pass would not come through Franconia Notch; they are going to find another route around Franconia Notch.

Bont said that there are pictures showing simulated view changes from various tourist sites in the handouts and in the Draft Northern Pass Transmission Line Project Environmental Impact Statement Summary dated July 2015. Bont said if the simulated views are accurate, when you sit on the porch of the Mountain View Grand you will be able to see a swath of downed trees and power lines all across your view from left to right.

Bont said that the Northern Country Scenic Byways Council ("Council") has been working on the various scenic corridor management plans. The Council is trying to generate more tourist engagement in the northern part of the state. The Council has developed management plans for several scenic tours that include both bike trails and touring trails. The Northern Pass Project will cross over the tourists corridors in several places. You will be able to see the trees they cut down and the 80 foot high transmission lines. This is north of Bethlehem. There will be places where the transmission line will not be buried. You will be able to see the poles and wires. Bont said that the Environmental Impact Study will be in the office for the Planning Board to come and review. Responses to the Environmental Impact Statement are due in 90 days of the date of the report.

US Department of Energy Public Hearings are scheduled for:	
Tuesday	October 06, 2015 Concord
Wednesday	October 07, 2015 Whitefield
Thursday	October 08, 2015 Plymouth

Hettinger asked who gave the approval to the to not bury the sections that are not buried.

Bont said she understood from members of the Council that the reason the transmission line is going through the State of New Hampshire is because the State of New Hampshire is not requiring them to bury the line. The States of Vermont and Maine both require them to bury the cables. Bont said that the Northern Country Scenic Byways Council ("Council") wants them to bury the rest of it.



Hettinger said that it was not a done deal then it could still come up.

Bont said yes, but you only have 60 days from August 1, 2015 to have a response to:

Brian Mills  
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability (OE-20)  
US Department of Energy,  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585  
[draftEIScomments@northernpasseis.us](mailto:draftEIScomments@northernpasseis.us)  
<http://www.northernpasseis.us/>  
Mark envelopes and electronic mail subject lines as “Northern Pass Draft EIS  
Comments” received by October 29, 2015.

Robinson said they are having a open house in each county. The proposed route does not go through Lincoln, but the area meeting is in Lincoln at the Mountain Club at Loon on September 8, 2015 starting at 5:00PM.

Bont said we understand the transmission line will be going through Woodstock, but it will be buried. There was a brief discussion by the Planning Board about the pros and cons of burying the transmission line versus erecting the line above ground. Robinson said that this is just a proposal. Town Manager Burbank said that the line will be buried in Woodstock and they will not see it. Town Manager Burbank also commented that where the line will be buried under a road, those roads will have top shelf paving and upgrading as part of the project. That is one of the selling points from NH DOT’s perspective. Bont said although paving is a onetime operation, residents will have to look at the wires or the swatch of severed trees forever.

There was another brief discussion about the Northern Pass.

- V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND OTHER BUSINESS:** Public comment and opinion are welcome during this open session. However, comments and opinions related to development projects currently being reviewed by the Planning Board will be heard only during a scheduled public hearing when all interested parties have the opportunity to participate.

- A. Notice of Development of Potential Regional Impact - Town of Lincoln is within 20 miles of the proposed 150’ Communications Tower in the Town of Easton, so the Town of Lincoln has been notified. Co-applicants Blue Sky Towers, LLC and T-Mobile Northeast, LLC, on behalf of property owner T&T MTN Investments, LLC, have applied to erect a proposed communications tower in Easton. Such a project falls within the definition of a “Development of Potential Regional Impact.” Would the proposed cell tower be viewable from the Town of Lincoln?

The hearing will be on Wednesday, August 26, 2015, at 7PM at the Easton Town Hall Meeting Room, 1060 Easton Valley Road, Easton, NH 03580. The Easton meeting conflicts with this Planning Board meeting.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion to adjourn at 6:57 PM:**

**Motion: John Hettinger      Second: Taylor Beaudin**

**All in Favor: (5-0)**

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Tanner, Planning and Zoning  
Recorder

Dated: August 26, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James Spanos, Chairman