

**TOWN OF BARTLETT PLANNING BOARD  
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

**April 19, 2016**

**Members Present:** Chairman Philip Franklin; David Shedd; David L. Patch; Scott Grant; Peter Gagne.

**Members Absent:** David A. Patch; Richard Stimpson (both with notice).

**Others in attendance:** Norman Head.

The Chairman opened the meeting at 7:02 pm, and briefly reviewed the items on the agenda.

**1. Master Plan:** The Chairman advised he had sent everyone a copy of the updated master plan which incorporated comments made at the last meeting. The Chairman then advised that he had been contacted by telephone and by email by an individual who wished to submit comments on the master plan, even though the public hearing had been closed. He said the individual had originally planned to be in attendance tonight, but ultimately decided to reach out to the board in a written manner. This person requested to remain unnamed until the board had read their comments. The Chairman provided a copy of the email, with the writer's name obscured, and requested that the board read it. The board complied.

The board reviewed the revisions made to the master plan, which the Chairman said were mostly minor in nature. It was agreed to remove an item which had been added under Recommendations: Town Facilities and Infrastructure, which gave consideration to the addition of a second vehicle access across the Saco and East Branch Rivers. David L. Patch, who was not present when this item was discussed last meeting, asked to comment on the recommendation. He recalled that when the Stanton Farm development first went in under the original owners, it was required that the planning board conduct a study to determine whether a second access was necessary. Mr. Patch said as part of the study, the state determined that based on the size of the area and density of the population, and even after Stilling's Grant was fully maxed out, there would still need to be four times as much development in the area to warrant a second access across the river. David Shedd said he had only mentioned the East Branch River as being a similar situation and didn't mean to imply a second access was necessary. Mr. Shedd agreed the two issues were worth thinking about, but felt it would be a hard sell and impractical at this time due to the associated high costs. In the next bullet of the same section, the board agreed to remove the names of the roads given as examples of where two-lane traffic is a challenge or visibility is limited after David Shedd noted that West Side Road is not a town road but is maintained by the state.

The board then discussed the aforementioned email provided by the Chairman. It expressed the writer's concerns on what they felt was clearly a push in the new master plan for additional motorized (e.g. snowmobiling) opportunities. Under the section titled Specific Challenges, they took exception to the inclusion of opportunities for motorized usage being included under the same bullet as opportunities for non-motorized usage, saying it distracted from the original intent of addressing non-motorized opportunities. The writer stated that since motorized use had a much larger impact on the character of the town and the environment, that it should be dealt with under its own bullet. They further felt that this item should not even be included under Specific Challenges at this point, as it insinuated the town was already comfortable expanding motorized sports, which was not the case. Other concerns expressed by the writer included the wording, "Consider opportunities for additional motorized winter sports in appropriate corridors" under the Recreation section to be very open ended, and they asked what and where is an appropriate corridor. The email concluded by saying there is obviously a limit to how much motorized recreation can be allowed before it affects the quality of life in the town, and before we open our closed loop system to the rest of New Hampshire, the planning board should "consider" both the positive and negative impact it would have on the town's character as a whole, and how it would affect the residential area, the environment, and existing businesses.

The Chairman then shared the context of his phone conversations with the individual. He said the individual was concerned about the amount of traffic additional snowmobiles would bring into town and about the whole idea of a recreational corridor opening up a broader cross-section of recreational activities in town, especially in the winter. He was asked how much time the board spent considering the whole snowmobile situation. The Chairman stated he responded by saying he thought there was a reasonable amount of time spent on the whole discussion regarding the subject. He further informed the individual he thought that taking out mention of snowmobiles would leave an empty space in the master plan

since it's a major recreational activity in the winter, not only in Bartlett but throughout all the North Country, and there would be questions raised if it was omitted. If and when the recreational corridor gets proposed, then a lot of the questions raised by the individual would be brought up and addressed at that time.

David L. Patch noted the master plan only speaks about motorized vehicles and snowmobiles in a general way, and to do something specific would require an amendment to the zoning ordinance to allow for it. The Chairman noted that process would require public hearings and public input. He said he had checked the master plan and found equal references to both cross-country skiing and snowmobiling. Mr. Patch agreed it was a fairness issue. He said he was a Fish and Game commissioner and advised any property under their jurisdiction was required to be multi-use. David Shedd said he had been contacted by the same individual. He said they were well aware that something had to first show-up in the master plan before it could be implemented. He felt this was the main reason for the individual's concern about its inclusion. Scott Grant further said he had also conversed the individual and had personally emailed them the minutes of every planning board meeting, so they were well informed on what had taken place. He felt their major concern was that if snowmobiles became a recognized use, then the state may decide to allow them to run from Conway to Bretton Woods using the state-owned railway lines. Mr. Grant acknowledged that may be a tough fight and was a whole different issue, but said, in fairness, he didn't think the state-run railway should be just for the benefit of the Conway Scenic Railroad since snowmobiles often had nowhere else to go. He added that the master plan needed to be fair and open. Peter Gagne explained that all the trails in the White Mountain National Forest and the Bartlett Experimental Forest, etc. were multi-use trails. He said the trail the individual is concerned about is not even proposed to be in Bartlett, but in Albany. He felt the individual's concerns were more of a self-interest issue. The Chairman said he broached that thought with the individual as well. He explained the master plan was not an enforcement document and if snowmobilers were on cross-country ski trails where they shouldn't be, then it was an enforcement issue involving Fish and Game who should be out there issuing tickets. The Chairman then identified the individual as the owner of Bear Notch Ski Touring, Doug Garland. He asked that the record reflect that he did not tell Mr. Garland he could not attend the meeting tonight, and the decision to reach-out to the board in writing was Mr. Garland's. David Shedd noted that as painful as the snowmobile issue was to Mr. Garland, he had acknowledged that the planning board had acted responsibly and had gone above and beyond in their efforts to obtain public input.

The Chairman said he will make the minor edits discussed tonight to the master plan and asked if there were any further comments from the board. With none, a motion was made by Scott Grant; seconded by David Shedd, to accept the master plan as edited. Vote: All in favor. The Chairman acknowledged and thanked former chairman David Publicover for the huge effort and hard work he had expended on the updates to this plan. He proposed that future updates be done in smaller increments and the plan be looked at every two years by a few members to see if everything was still relevant. This would help expedite and make easier the required 5-year update.

**2. Preliminary Review: Range View Cabins LLC (Roger and Maureen Lemay), 1069 US Route 302, Bartlett.**

File: 2016-1214. Application to voluntary merge two lots into a 2.07-acre parcel, then create a 3-unit subdivision from the merged property. Tax Map 3RT302, Lots 285L00 and L01.

The Chairman explained this property was located next to Gene Chandler's residence and consisted of two lots totaling just over two acres which had approximately 300-ft. frontage onto Route 302. The owner would like to merge the two lots only if the board agreed to allow the 3-unit PUD subdivision. Each lot is currently served by a driveway: one on Lot 285L00 leads to a long-existing residence which has recently been renovated, and another on Lot 285L01 is shared by a new residence under construction and a third proposed residence which has not yet been built. Norman Head noted the proposed merger would mean a single lot would then have two driveways on it. He wondered whether the state would allow two curb cuts onto Route 302 once the lots were merged or whether one driveway permit would be rescinded. The board briefly discussed the possibility of having all three units on a single driveway while recognizing the fact that the applicant probably would not want to incur the cost of building a town-spec road. Mr. Head asked how wide the driveways were. The width wasn't shown on the plan, but by scaling them off they appeared to be 15-20 foot wide. The density numbers were checked, which indicated there was more than enough density on the merged lot to support the nine bedrooms being proposed (3 x 3-bedroom units). State septic approval was pending. Mr. Head then asked if the units were

going to be rented on a nightly or weekly basis, would that make this a commercial project and what would the requirements be for that? This application will be formally submitted at the May 2 public hearing.

**3. Review and Approve Minutes:** The board reviewed the April 4, 2016 minutes. On page 1, second-last paragraph, the Chairman noted a typo where Moat Mountain Brewery had been written as Mt. Mountain Brewery. Same page, bottom line, David Shedd noted that the minutes indicated that a public hearing to approve the master plan would be held in May. This was incorrect and after two prior public hearing the board determined there was no need for a third and the plan was ready for approval tonight. A note will be added to the minutes directing the reader to the April 19 minutes for clarification. A motion to approve the minutes, as amended, was made by Scott Grant; seconded by David L. Patch. Vote: All in favor.

**Mail and Other Business:**

- There was no mail on the agenda.
- The Chairman updated the progress of the relocated planning board office by saying that a new Microsoft Office package, including Word and Excel, had been installed on the secretary's computer and that all the items requested by the board had now been taken care of. He expressed his thanks to AA Lynn Jones for being extremely helpful in getting the office up-and-running.
- Peter Gagne asked about a friend who owned property and was looking to build multiple units on it. Since the buildings would all be owned by the same person, he asked whether more than two residences could be served by a driveway.
- The Chairman noted that all the minutes were now on the town's website, but said he had difficulty in opening them. He felt this was a result of them being posted as a zip file. He indicated he will look into resolving this issue with the website administrator and will also look into the possibility of making the planning board section of the site more user-friendly.
- Peter Gagne provided an item he would like posted on the website which showed the planning board meeting dates and the date that applications were due by, as well as the names and of each board member and the year their term expires.
- Peter Gagne indicated he would attend the upcoming OEP planning and zoning conference on June 4.
- The Chairman provided wording for a header over the continued AMSCO item on the agenda.

With no further business, a motion to adjourn was made by Scott Grant; seconded by David L. Patch. Vote: All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara Bush  
Recording Secretary