

**Town of Northwood
Planning Board
June 28, 2012**

Chairman Robert Strobel calls the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Robert Strobel, Selectmen Representative Scott Bryer, Joe McCaffrey, Alternate Adam Sprague, Town Planner Elaine Planchet, and Board Administrator Linda Smith.
Rick Wolf arrives at 7:25 p.m. Alternate Victoria Parmele arrives at 8:25.
Vice Chairman Tim Jandebaur arrives at 9:10.

VOTING DESIGNATION: Bob Strobel, Scott Bryer, Joe McCaffrey, and Alternate Adam Sprague. Rick Wolf at 7:25 p.m. Victoria Parmele at 8:25.
Tim Jandebaur at 9:10.

ABSENT: Babette Morrill and Herb Johnson

MINUTES

June 14, 2012

Mr. McCaffrey makes a motion, second by Mr. Bryer, to approve the minutes of June 14, 2012, as amended as follows:

Page 2: Change: ...is... to ...*should be*...

Page 2: Change: ...is... to ...*its*...

Page 2: Change: ...representatively... to ...*as representative*...

Page 3: Change: ...here... to ...*there*...

Motion passes; 3/0/1. Mr. Sprague abstains.

CASES

Case 12-06: Thomas Albright; 49 Lucas Pond Rd. Map 124; Lot 1.

Applicant seeks home business review application for a nano-brewery. (Property currently owned by Lee Baldwin).

Members review the case materials. Mr. Strobel explains the planning board process.

Mr. Bryer makes a motion to accept the application as complete. Second by Mr. McCaffrey. Motion passes unanimously; Vote: 4/0.

Mr. Strobel reads the abutters list. Abutters present are Peter Lebel, Rebecca Rule, and the Shaw Estate represented by four people. Also present is Lee Baldwin, property owner and the applicant Mr. Albright.

Mr. Albright provides an overview of the proposal. He explains that a Nano brewery makes less than 10,000 barrels of beer per year; a barrel is 31 US gallons. He states that he will produce less than 200 gallons per year. He states that he will be using a home brew system, making 10 gallons at one time. He adds that should he upgrade then he would brew

**Town of Northwood
Planning Board
June 28, 2012**

twice per week totaling 108 gallons per year. He notes that because it is a nano brewery, all materials must be self-distributed and, therefore, there will be no increase in the traffic. He states that there will be no retail sales out of the property and that he will not have any employees.

Ms. Planchet directs the board to the draft site plan and states that the brewery is proposed to be in one bay of the existing two car garage. Mr. Albright states that there will be no additional out buildings added.

Mr. McCaffrey asks if the abutters are in favor of the proposal or are just neutral. A member of the public asks if they hope to expand the business. Mr. Albright states that he hopes to upgrade the existing gallon system to the barrel system of 31 gallons, which will still be using only one bay of the garage. Ms. Baldwin states that the current proposal will remain for a considerable amount of time.

Rick Wolf arrives at 7:25 and is a voting member.

A member of the public asks if there is any odor in brewing. Mr. Albright replies not at the proposed level.

Sharon Barrett states that she is in favor of another Northwood business and states that the proposal is a safe operation.

Mr. Wolf asks about the hours of operation. Mr. Albright states that he is proposing from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. and 7 days a week. He states that he will be brewing two days per week, bottling two days a week, and distributing two days per week. Mr. Wolf expresses concern with a business within a residential area that is open 7 days per week. Mr. Albright states that the traffic will not be increased. Mr. Bryer states that this is a small operation.

Mr. McCaffrey asks how far back the garage is from the road. Mr. Albright states that it is approximately 150'. Mr. McCaffrey asks what happens to the used product once the brewing takes place. Mr. Albright states that the waste and grain is given to their chickens or the goats.

Ms. Planchet refers to the staff notes and states that the applicant has provided responses. She states that the date for the application needs to be added and that some items depend on what the board wants on the site plan. Ms. Planchet states that the parking is not delineated and the hours of operation are different than what has been stated tonight. She states that these items are up to the board to decide. She adds that the board also had questions regarding the quantity of water required. She

**Town of Northwood
Planning Board
June 28, 2012**

refers to the follow up information provided by the applicant. She adds that there was some discussion regarding a state approved septic system. She states that a copy of the approval of operation certificate was provided, dated November 19, 1984. Ms. Planchet states that there is an amended plan dated 1999 that was provided with the application.

Mr. McCaffrey asks about the parking area. Mr. Albright states that it is 9ft. wide, about one car width wide. Mr. Strobel states that the plan is to scale; the graph is not shown through the copies.

Peter Lebell asks about the noise level of the proposed business. Ms. Baldwin states that if there is activity going on in the garage, she cannot hear it from the house.

Ms. Planchet asks about additional permits. Mr. Albright explains that once he has planning board approval, then he must get a federal permit, followed by the state.

Mr. McCaffrey makes a motion to approve the application. No second is provided.

Mr. McCaffrey makes a motion to approve the application, with the following conditions:

- **All local permits to be obtained;**
- **Hours of operation to be 7am to 7pm; 7 days a week;**
- **Operation limited to brewery space as shown on the plan; and**
- **Condition of operation that all federal and state permits be on file.**

Second by Mr. Bryer. Motion passes unanimously; 5/0.

Case 12-07: John & Karen Fernandes; North River Lake Rd. Map 233; Lots 5 & 6. Applicants seek boundary line adjustment to adjust the lot line of Map 1; Lot 37 in Nottingham and Map 233; Lot 6 in Northwood; lots 5 & 6 proposed to be consolidated.

Mr. & Mrs. Fernandes are present.

Ms. Planchet states that there were some questions that the board had and those questions were submitted to legal counsel. She states that no response has been received from legal counsel to date.

Ms. Smith explains that the case material was sent to the board's attorney for review. At this time, the attorney has not had an opportunity to review the materials.

**Town of Northwood
Planning Board
June 28, 2012**

Ms. Planchet suggests that the board review the materials and determine if the application is complete.

Ms. Planchet provides an overview of the proposal. She states that it is complicated as the boundary line goes through the town line with Nottingham. She states that there is a question on the actual number of lots.

Ms. Smith refers to a survey of the area and explains that another owner submitted an application to the zoning board, and after counsel review, a decision was rendered that the evidence available to the zoning board of adjustment (ZBA) established that this parcel was a part of a 2.11 acre lot in Northwood, when the applicant acquired it by deed in 2010. She continues and states that the ZBA also determined that there was no evidence of subdivision of the lot and RSA 674:53 is and has been inapplicable as the proposed Northwood portion needs land in Nottingham to meet minimum lot size requirements. She states that the applicant wanted to build on the Northwood side after building on the Nottingham side. She notes that the lot has never been subdivided. She states that a deed was conveyed from the Nottingham portion and recorded at the registry but that no subdivision of the lot has occurred. She states that this is why legal opinion has been requested regarding how the board should proceed. She explains that the deed is in conflict with the surveyed plan.

A discussion is held regarding the lot being a buildable lot. Ms. Smith states that the town's assessor changed the assessment of the lot based on the ZBA's decision that this is one parcel.

Mr. Bryer makes a motion, second by Mr. McCaffrey, to postpone this case until the legal opinion is received. Ms. Smith suggests continuing to the regular July meeting.

Mr. Bryer asks if the application is complete. Ms. Planchet states that more information has been submitted tonight. She states that the septic plan was provided today and she would like the opportunity to review that information to make sure that it is sufficient.

Additional discussion is held regarding the completeness of the application. Ms. Planchet states that the surveyor has been responsive in provided answers to the TRC notes; some information was just received today.

**Town of Northwood
Planning Board
June 28, 2012**

The board discusses that the following items are necessary to consider the application complete:

- Any potential wetlands need to be delineated by a wetlands scientist
- No contour lines shown or waiver requests
- No soil types shown or waiver requests
- No road frontage
- Legal opinion status of the survey or deed
- Wells, septic systems, structures, must be shown on the site plan within 100 feet; needs to be verified
- Setbacks need to be shown on the plan

Mr. Bryer and Mr. McCaffrey rescind the motion and second.

Mr. Bryer makes a motion, second by Mr. McCaffrey, to not accept the application as complete for reasons discussed and listed. Motion passes unanimously; 5/0.

Mr. Bryer makes a motion, second by Mr. McCaffrey, to continue the discussion of the application to the July regular monthly meeting; July 26, 7:00 p.m. Motion passes unanimously; 5/0.

Ms. Parmele arrives at 8:25 and is a voting member.

OTHER

Master Plan Update

Ms. Planchet provides an overview of documents she has created with results of the master plan survey. She explains that she compiled the responses separately for business and residents' responses. She states that 100 responses were received from year round residents and 19 were received from businesses who are also year round residents.

The board reviews the materials and general discussions are held.

Discussion is held with Sharon Barrett, local business owner, who explains her opinion of the business climate in Northwood. She states that the planning board process was very difficult. She states that Rte. 4 is not a destination anymore; it is a corridor and it is sad. She suggests that there should be some type of a coffee shop here in town that provides bathroom facilities to patrons. Discussion ensues regarding facilities and assets throughout town.

Ms. Parmele suggests loop roads off from Rte. 4. Mr. McCaffrey states that there was a concentration of antique shops and that made Rte. 4 a

**Town of Northwood
Planning Board
June 28, 2012**

destination. He states that many of the antique shops in town have either changed or are now gone; some of that outcome is due to the economy. He adds that the planning board is not able to generate a business; all we can do is to make Northwood and the process as attractive as possible and not get in the way of the process.

Ms. Planchet states that there could be some overlapping of conversations with the folks who work on the economic development update and transportation issues.

Mr. Bryer states that he receives many comments similar to Ms. Barrett's. He adds that he is very disappointed in the quantity of responses returned to the board. Discussion ensues relative to the vision statement, is the current vision statement consistent with the comments received in the survey, and the session comments. Ms. Parmele states that the vision will come when the entire project is discussed and more people need to be involved. Mr. Strobel states that he is trying to work on the direction of the vision statement.

Lengthy discussion ensues. Ms. Planchet states that another step is whether the implementation steps from the previous master plan have been accomplished. She states that there needs to be some kind of directional decision made soon by the planning board.

Ms. Parmele suggests that the board work on the master plan by chapters and address each accordingly. Ms. Planchet states that the transportation chapter and economic development chapters may need to be updated, but that if they are worked on independently of an overall vision, they may conflict with each other. Ms. Parmele agrees that there may be conflicts. Mr. Strobel states that he would like to see the changes from the current visioning statement based on the survey responses. He states that this is what he wants to address at the next meeting as it will give him an idea to see what areas will need the most work.

Mr. Jandebour arrives at 9:10 pm

Scenic Byway

Ms. Planchet states that Kyle Pimental from the SRPC has met with the planning board previously and presented to the BOS last week regarding the Scenic Byway proposal. She states that Mr. Lemire had asked her to ask the planning board if they have an opinion on the project. She asks if the board would take a formal vote regarding supporting the Scenic Byway through Northwood.

**Town of Northwood
Planning Board
June 28, 2012**

Mr. Bryer states that Nottingham is not interested in the scenic byway at this time. Mr. Strobel explains that there are many benefits. He states that this is a region wide notice which would highlight one region's economic, historic, recreational, and cultural facilities in the area. Mr. Strobel mentions surrounding areas and the area assets. He states that he participates in this project as a private citizen.

Additional discussion ensues as to the pros/cons of accepting the scenic by-way designation project and the need for more businesses and services. Mr. Bryer states he would like to hear from other boards before he agrees to support the idea. He expresses concern with signage on the roadways and mentions that there is control of off premise signs.

Mr. Strobel asks for and notes that a straw poll consensus shows 4 to be in favor; 2 undecided. He states that the next Scenic Byway meeting is scheduled for August.

SRPC MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Appointment
Mr. Jandebaur makes a motion, second by Ms. Parmele, to appoint Ms. Parmele as the planning board representative to this position. Motion passes; 6/0/1. Ms. Parmele abstains. Mr. Sprague states he will plan to attend as well.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Jandebaur makes a motion to adjourn. Mr. Bryer seconds. Motion passes unanimously at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa J. Fellows-Weaver
Board Secretary