

**TOWN OF BARTLETT**  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
**56 TOWN HALL ROAD**  
**INTERVALE, NH 03845**  
**603-356-2226**

---

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**PUBLIC SESSION**

**April 7, 2025**

**6:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Scott Grant (Chair), David Patch (Vice Chair), Vicki Garland (Selectmen Representative), Kevin Bennett, Michael Galante, Joe Heuston, David Shedd, Pat Roberts (1<sup>st</sup> Alternate), Heather Forbes (2<sup>nd</sup> Alternate)

**Also present:** Burr Philips PE, CPESC Civil Solutions, LLC

Meeting called to order by Scott Grant at 6:00 PM

**1. Pledge of Allegiance-** led by Scott Grant

**2. Election of officers-** election of chair and vice chair. Motion made by Joe Heuston seconded by David Patch to nominate Scott Grant as chair. No other nominations voiced. Vote unanimous. Motion made by Joe Heuston seconded by Vicki Garland to nominate David Patch as vice chair. No other nominations voiced. Vote unanimous.

**3. Discussion of application/new business:**

- **Cedarcroft Farm LLC (Map 1THORN/Lots 54L00 and 42L00)-** Continuation of project: Cedarcroft Farms LLC subdivision of the property owned by Cedarcroft Farms Tax map 1THORN lot 54L00 into the 33-unit PUD. Update on application. Andy Fisher from Ammonoosuc Survey presented. The engineers are working with Burr Philips regarding a design and review. They are waiting for the snow to clear to work on the design along 16/302 for the turn lane analysis and design. Motion made by Vicki Garland seconded by Kevin Bennett to continue the application till May 5, 2025. Vote unanimous.

- **Jason Brown (Map 2RT302 Parcel 161L00, 165L00 and 170L00)**- Continuation of project: update regarding application. Andy Fisher from Ammonoosuc Survey presented. He believed the board granted conditional approval and he was not clear as to why the project was on the agenda. The surety bond was provided to the town and accepted and that was the last item to be accomplished. The last item would be the construction of the road which has not happened due to the weather. The road design has been approved. Burr Philips requested to be notified when the road was to be started so a pre-construction meeting could occur. Andy Fisher acknowledged he understood. Scott Grant stated that final approval will occur when the road is begun. David Patch stated that the board will continue the application till final approval is in place. Andy Fisher agreed to provide monthly updates either in person or in writing until that time. This was agreeable to the board. David Shedd asked if the owner wanted to start selling lots before the water lines and road were in place? Andy Fisher re-assured the board that the owner knows he can't sell lots until he has the final approval of the board. Scott Grant asked if the owner had a time in mind for his project. Andy Fisher replied the owner was eager but no timeline that he was aware of. Motion made by Mike Galante seconded by Vicki Garland to continue the application till May 5, 2025 meeting vote unanimous.
- **AMSCO (Tax Map 5STLNG Parcel 000G00)**- subdivision of Block G (Phase 1) in Stillings Grant- extension of Cave Mountain Rd and 1 lot for system pump storage tank. Continuation of project Update on application. Board agreed to allow an out of order of the agenda to hear this application first. Dan Lucchetti from Rotten Rock presented. He voiced they are looking for a continuance to get their plans more concrete regarding concerns the Planning Board voiced at the last meeting. They would like to present a complete package to the board. He stated that they were happy to answer any questions the board may have. David Shedd encouraged them to stay for the meeting and be available after it was complete for a more in-depth discussion. Dan Lucchetti reported that Rotten Rock met with Burr Philips that morning to discuss the road and water system but they do not have plans for the board to review. Motion made by David Patch seconded by Joe Heuston to continue the application till May 5, 2025 vote unanimous. However Rotten Rock agreed to stay and answer any questions the board may have. Later in the meeting there was a discussion with AMSCO and Rotten Rock regarding Block G. David Shedd discussed the history of the project and expressed his concerns about getting out of Block F and starting the road with Block G. He referenced a comprehensive road plan that was prepared by Mark Lucy from 2023 and he expressed concern about the road grade- he expressed that there was waiver for the grade was given when the Planning Board still had purview over the roads. The waiver given allowed for more than 10% grade as you went over the crest of the hill. Mark has on his plan there is a 12% grade over the big ditch which I believe there is no waiver for that. That is a significant point. We also received a plan on Friday from Horizon but I have some issues with the plan. When you leave map C2.1 and you are looking at your proposed

grade you are at 1000 feet when you match it to map C2.2 at that same point you are at 1010 feet you lost 10 feet which is significant. If you are over grading you already are having a grade issue going over the ditch. Another issue I found was there was a booster pump in Block F where the driveway is for the three houses that go into lot F6- I don't think there is a 10x12 building on the plan. Jim Wilson HOA President Stillings Grant stated he could speak to the issue of the pump house. David Shedd asked do all the lots in Block F have the water pressure they need? Jim Wilson stated the system was not exactly put in the way DES wanted the taps were not put above the valve cluster by the transformer they were placed below. The solution to that was either move the pumphouse downhill near lot one where the PRB station is now or get this project approved. David Shedd clarified if the water line is approved as proposed then the pump house would not be needed. Jim Wilson stated there is one house there that falls withing our permit specifications (30 to 65) it is at 32. Last March AMSCO with Horizon received a 5-year waiver to put individual air gaps booster pumps in each station. There is not a lot pumped directly out of the system anymore. Alec Tarberry could place this in 4 more lots above this lot. The rest were supposed to be pressurized by the lower zone. This was authorized last March so this project has to be either completed or a pump house has to be designed and installed further down Cave Mountain Road. David Shedd reported that he felt the water line is exactly at the same stage as the road- unable to go forward or go back. You can dig all you want but when the cement truck comes you need a definite plan in place. If you decide to go over the hill there is a far amount of work to get done and you may have an issue with grade also. He offered to Rotten Rock/Horizon/AMSCO come to the work sessions which occur in between the public hearings to review and work on the issues that are presented. Dan Lucchetti pointed out that the plans they received on Block F has a temporary cul-de-sac so he did not believe the profile meets, as a result, Block G would come down the hill and be picked up. He believed a lot of the grade would be taken care of. However, that is why they wanted to backup and take a look at the plans again. They meet with Burr Philips and Travis Chick today to look at the culvert issue which no one liked as it is. We wanted to get all of our options before we go over the hill and spend a lot of money. We wanted to make sure we would be able to sell lots to pay for that. Burr Phillips stated that the majority of the conversation with Rotten Rock was the culvert issue- a solution was discussed that Burr and Travis is comfortable with but needs to be discussed with the Selectmen- but it is a reasonable solution. The solution is to place an oversized concrete culvert so if anything happens, they can place a new pipe inside the old one down the road. The manhole is gotten rid of- the configuration was changed to accommodate that and there will be one pipe a little bit shorter and a little less deep. Vicki Garland asked if that would prevent if a problem arose having to vent the culvert at 30 feet deep could you get to it from the side. Dan Lucchetti replied you could align it from the end and it is engineered for the load for the cover that is over the culvert and there are different engineered

culverts for that. Burr Phillips replied in regards to the phase of Block F design which starts at station 7 which is 725 feet (which will become 625 as the first station is at 100 feet) that is where the road changes from Block F to Block G. If you do Block F the way it is approved, it does say temporary, but the profile is based on the Block F design. The end of the cul-de-sac is 10 feet lower than what the grade would be when they build Block G so that makes up the difference. That was the point we discussed today- somehow or another they have to figure out a way to amend the Block F road design or the Block F approval to make this work. David Shedd asked if you have to increase the road grade how does that affect the water line in terms of shut offs? Burr Phillips replied that is why he was looking at the grade difference- he was not sure where the water line ended but if it was built to the end then instead of being 7 feet deep it would be 17 feet deep. David Shedd expressed the water line ended with a hydrant. Dan Lucchetti replied it was below the temporary cul-de-sac because the cul-de-sac never got installed. David Shedd commented it would probably be up to the homeowner's association to determine how deep they want their cut offs to be. He also expressed a desire to have a map that showed the end of Block F and the beginning of Block G so we don't have to try and visualize that in our mind. The plans he has regarding the road do not show the cul-de-sac, the road shown is a continuous grade from Stanton Farm Road. Burr Phillips stated his thought was to absorb Block F into Block G and make it one project. Dan Lucchetti stated he has Block G plans that would go back into Block F and supersede the previous approval. David Shedd asked to discuss an issue that came up the last meeting which was the idea of when you could build and when you could sell lots-One of the fundamentals of our zoning ordinance is that you cannot create a lot that doesn't have 50 feet of frontage on a town approved road built to town standards. All the lots in Block F have been sold and at least one house built and the road is not done. I am hoping we will not find ourselves in that situation again with lots being sold and the road is not done. Burr Phillips replied that the town has a bond and that is whole reason why one is given. He continued to say if AMSCO/Rotten Rock give up the approval for Block F and if Block G goes all the way back to Stanton Farm Road and it is for one approval for Block G we will need a new bond before they can start selling lots. The bond will be higher maybe 2 or 3 million dollars before they can start selling any lots. This will be the same situation- if the company goes south for some reason the town would hire someone to finish the road. David Patch pointed out that when he looks at the road how it ended what do they have to do to get to Block G? You have to start up in Block G to start building it in one piece and come down to make your grades and conform to what we want. That would be easier that going around with a cul-de-sac that is going to disappear anyway. I have thought about this a lot. Burr Phillips asked if they felt they could not move forward on completing the road without selling lots? Dan Lucchetti replied that when they get to the top of the hill, they need something because they are spending a lot of money to do the pump station, the 10-inch water main, the 3- inch domestic pipe and the at least

8 hydrants. They talked about finishing the loop and bringing it to town standards to get it up there- at least the infrastructure would be there regarding the water mains or whatnot. We were thrown into the cul-de-sac situation and we decided to take a step back and get our wits about us. We already conquered the culvert situation and now we are making sure we have everything we submitted to the state with the water and everything. We knew we would not be approved today and we did not want to waste the board's time. We are moving forward in terms of fire suppression and the pump station up top is a huge undertaking and a big money grab for us. If we can't sell lots when we get to the top it will hamper us- what if we sell all the lots going up to there then it would afford us to do the rest more easily. Burr Phillips stated I guess what I am saying it would not make sense to have a new approval. Start back at Stanton Farm Road and goes as far up into Block G as you want whether it is the intersection or whatever with the water line connection. Once you have the approval for Block G and give the appropriate bond to the town the approval for Block F is rescinded. We do not want to give up approval for Block F until we know we have another bond and the new design approval. Scott Grant stated it was a great idea but it is up to Rotten Rock/AMSCO and Burr Phillips to decide. David Shedd asked what would they do after the intersection of the loop? Burr Phillips replied it was up to Rotten Rock to decide. They have the water line and the water tank to do for sure. David Shedd asked why the whole loop was being done if the question of funding was an issue. Dan Lucchetti replied that the loop is part of the solution because they have to go down to the pump station to feed back up. So, all that not finished is that small loop and we would be better served to just finish the water system. The water system was an issue at the last meeting so we are offering to put in the whole water system and at that point if we are putting in infrastructure and we would build it to Town specifications and have Burr do the inspections then we don't have to go back to do anything. This way when we come back to the Planning Board for (unofficially) G2 Phase 2 and we have the road to town specifications with Burr's oversight and the existing road design has been reviewed, vetted, commented on and approved then when we come in with phase 2 and say we want to build on these lots then it would be an easy conversation. David Shedd asked for the approximate cost of the road and water line being discussed. Dan Lucchetti replied we have some numbers together but the water system has been changed. We are awaiting some pricing on pipe. We had decisions made based on flow for hydrants and the elevation of the tanks but I do not have all that with me. Rotten Rock went back to the question regarding the cost and doing the entire loop for the water lines. They stated the only water line in the loop that is not essential to the entire system is the 3-inch domestic line that would provide domestic service throughout the loop. So it's essentially just putting in one more pipe in the same trench and the remaining loop is like 500 feet where we tie back in so it is more efficient to put the pipes in the same trench at the same time rather than digging it back up and potentially compromising existing pipes when we do the loop. David Shedd asked about the

rationale of the pump house below the tank on the map. Rotten Rock- it is for the domestic pressures. The building is small like 8x12. David Shedd stated he asked because if you look at the current plans referred to on pages C6.1 and C 6.4 and there are no C 6.1 plans for the building. I also see a 6-inch pipe going to the tank but should there be an 8-inch line coming back down? Rotten Rock clarified there is a 10-inch line coming down for fire suppression. They further stated that the plans that were received this past Friday and previous plans are not driving the project right now. These are issues we are trying to rectify. David Shedd replied that is the issue why is there a pump house so high up and only one pipe going up and none coming back down. Rotten Rock replied he was looking at the road plans and David Shedd clarified these were the water expansion plans we received. He did invite Rotten Rock, Horizons and Alec Tarberry to the work session to the Planning Board work session April 15, 2025. Pat Roberts read from a letter dated June 12, 1989 from the fire chief regarding the fire plan that was sent to him and he approved the plan. He asked if the current plan proposed is different from the previous plan.



Fire Chief letter  
1989.docx

Rotten Rock replied the road plan is the same but the water system is different. They further explained that as per Alec Tarberry there are supposed to be stubs and valves for hydrants off Parker Ridge Road. They are working with that knowledge to the best of their ability. Pat Roberts asked if the new plan looking for approval and is it a different system with different capabilities then the one approved in 1989? Rotten Rock explained the flows have been upgraded to a 10-inch main and it is going to be better than the system approved in 1989. We only want to do this once. Alec Tarberry interjected that we have less lots than in 1989 so the plans have to be different. David Shedd explained that if they were submitting a plan to DES as far as the water system referred to a 120,000-gallon tank and we talked about reducing it to 90,000-gallon tank (partly because that is what the homeowners prefer and because of the lack of water movement in the larger system) he asked if the Planning Board has to vote on the decreased water tank. Rotten Rock replied that it is based on flows and the 10-inch main is also storage for fire suppression, the 3-inch line is the domestic water. Jim Wilson stated that as per NFPA 1 the space between the houses is taken in account and we have 50 feet because of the 25-foot setback and the calculations cover how much storage is needed and the 90,000 gallons does cover the amount needed. We had one member who is an engineer in Massachusetts verify the calculations and agreed that 90,000-gallons is sufficient to meet the requirement for fire suppression. Our development is seasonal, about 60/40 in terms of residents. In the summer months we use a lot more water. We do not want stale water. These guys have designed (it is a little tricky on the controls) a system that stirs the water so it does not sit up in a tank. Water is pumped from the lower loop all the



way up Parker Ridge all the way around and it will also stir the water. The Residents Association would rather have better water and the 90,000- gallons meets the NFPA 1 standards. The plans show where the 1990 hydrants are and the hydrants for 2025 and there is one new one on Stanton Farm Road. The plans show what the fire flows are and basically, we meet the standards, some are a little close but it is better than what we have now. David Patch clarified the question regarding the new approval from 120,000-gallons to 90,000-ugallons, we do need one but when they get final approval and it is on the plans then they will have the new approval. It does not need to be a separate action. We can approve the plan and give everyone one more chance to review it. The fire chief will have to sign off on the plan. Alec Tarberry questioned the board asking if the plan goes to DES with the 3-30,000-gallon tanks and the board stated 120,000-fgallons that would be a significant change in the design. David Patch answered no that was not his intent at all but it is for Rotten Rock to take another look at the plan in terms of the work needed for the water lines and the road. Kevin Bennett stated he emailed the fire chief on Friday regarding the plans and he was not aware of the water line plans. He asked if we could keep the fire chief involved in the water plans. Clerk to email the fire chief and invite him to the planning board work session.

- **Egan-Scheid (Tax Map SKYVW Lots 4-11 and Outlot with Roadway D-** Burke York from York Land Services presented. Not an application yet just a follow up on previous questions from the last meeting. He introduced Dennis Egan and Megan Scheid. Preliminary plan was presented to the board. Three items of concern were raised last month. They plan on putting their application next month. He explained the plan is for 9 lots on Skyline Drive that they plan on merging into 3 lots-there will be 3 building sites. One question that came up was the neighbor Frances Duffy having two lots next door and would it preclude Dennis/Megan from having three houses on a driveway if she decided to develop that back lot? They met with Frances Duffy and a letter was presented to the board.



Letter from Frances  
Duffy 04-03-2025.doc

Burke also spoke to Dennis Egan/Megan Scheid's council Ken Cargill of Cooper Cargill Chant in North Conway. His opinion was in regards to the concept of merger by conduct- basically, Frances Duffy's house was on two lots and in essence is already a merger. He said that Frances two lots are effectively merged by construction of a residence that straddles the lot lines. He also said he was not sure how that would impact their proposed project. Burke York stated that if it is one lot it impacts us greatly and we can continue with three houses. The other question that was raised last meeting was changing the road and doing the mergers change these from lots of record to a new lot requiring minimum standards today. The question was if we merge the lots of record from 9 to 3 would this action based on Bartlett zoning rules require the new lot to be

compliant with current standards? Ken Cargill stated generally speaking a merger that improves the extent of non-conformity will be approved by the Planning Board. Compliance with the current standards should not be required as long as the overall compliance is approved. Burke emphasized that was Ken Cargill's opinion and he is not telling you what to do- Ken Cargill also stated that the plan indicated an overall improvement and the board has some discretion on the matter. We plan on eliminating the cul-de-sac that is present but we don't have to, we could continue with the lots as they are, however we agree it is a better plan to eliminate the cul-de-sac because it is not needed for a driveway with three houses. David Patch stated that historically whenever we have a situation like this, and we have had some even worse than this as far as the number of lots on a small piece of property, we look to improve it to the best of your ability. Then usually we go with that. David Shedd brought up the fact that Lynn Jones recommended or advised some sort of testing to see the number of bedrooms allowed. He believed that Burke/Dennis/Megan were looking at 4-bedroom houses here. Burke spoke about the zoning ordinance regarding minimum land area page 9- if we were to create a new development, we would have to meet minimum land area standards. However, if you go to Section G- single house lots of record are exempt from the provisions of this article. He wanted conformation from the Select Board regarding this issue. My explanation to them was if I go down the street and had a lot of record and showed up with a septic plan/design, the Select Board would not look at the zoning ordinance since it is a lot of record. They would allow what the state would allow on that piece of property (putting aside the subdivision part of it). So, if this was a free-standing piece of land that needed a well, I would look at gallons/day standards as the state requires and that is how I would design my septic plan. In some cases, it may only be 2 bedrooms sometimes three or maybe it will be 10, it is whatever the state allows on these individual lots. We have water and sewer available to us so the state could allow a 100-bedroom motel and the town would have to approve that because they are lots of record. What got sticky last time is a definition of a lot of record. Burke thought Ken Cargill's opinion kind of explains that it's certainly by taking three original lots of record and making it one we are improving the situation. As far as gallons per day at the state requirement we have water and sewer and that is kind of unlimited in their eyes. What we want to come in with next month are lots of record being merged with minor lot line adjustments and then allowing us four bedrooms on each lot of record combined. David Shedd reminded Burke that the town recognizes state standards but we do not go by them. If the state says you can have 4-bedrooms we say you can have three. He asked Burke if he was trying to bypass this. Burke answered no but the standard on lots of record in Section G say single house lots of record are exempt from the provision of minimum land area. The MLA does not count if I bring in a septic design and it is strictly by gallons per day by the state standards and in this case, we have water and sewer so it is unlimited for us. Vicki Garland had a correction regarding the meeting with the Select Board as he met with one Select men and



Lynn Jones- it was not an official meeting – no votes or minutes taken. There is no record of that meeting whatsoever. She wanted the board to know because the email sent implied otherwise. Burke clarified he met with the Select Office because he needed clarification because if he brings in a septic design, they don't look at MLA they look at gallons/day. They reviewed how it is handled here in Bartlett and it is gallons/day by the state standard. Gene Chandler happened to be there and it was not a formal meeting or anything like that. He called ahead to make an appointment with Lynn to verify exactly how to handle things when I bring a design in to make sure gallons/day is actually the case. Pat Roberts asked a question stating he had no issue with a lot of record but when you are combining three lots doesn't the lot of record go away and this now becomes a brand-new lot? Burke replied that Council's opinion is that they are lots of record and they still are lots of record. David Patch discussed the history of lots of record. There were developments that had 100x100 foot lots with not the best drainage or slope. When we wrote the zoning ordinance, we put that section in about lots of record because we did not want to take a person's lot of record and make it worthless or non- buildable. That way we allow people to design a septic system to put something on that lot of record. It was looked at exactly as Council said- if you can improve the situation like taking 2 or 3 100x100 foot lots and make one as long as it was substantially better then you create one lot. We certainly did not want a house on every 100x100 foot lot so the board has leaned towards the better situation. This is one of those situations, it is better to have 3 lots instead of 9 but since they are lots of record you could really have 9 sites. This is a good common-sense solution and has historical backing (taking the 9 lots and combining them into 3). David Shedd asked if the Selectmen that he met with was he receptive to the proposal? The plan is complicated enough without a fight with the Selectmen. Burke replied that Gene Chandler was there and listened in- he did not express an opinion either way. He emphasized that his main reason for the meeting was to discuss how the Town of Bartlett handles individual lots of record and septic systems. Lynn Jones had told him it is basically whatever the state allows. Kevin Bennett asked what the total acreage was of the property? Burke replied four and a half acres. The majority of the board are in agreement that the plan of taking 9 lots and condensing them to 3 lots are definitely a better situation. Scott Grant commented that these lots were established prior to zoning was in place but he wanted to clarify that the state has minimum land area for septic and if they allow 4 bedrooms then Bartlett allows 75% or 3 bedrooms and we do not allow for more density for water or sewer. He hopes the voluntary lot merger happens before the application for the project is filed. Vicki Garland read her response from Lynn Jones regarding the meeting Burke stated he had with the Select Board- "Burke York asked to meet with me yesterday because he had some septic questions. Gene was here and joined in the meeting. We told him that if he changes the existing lot lines that he would have to comply with the regulations in effect now the grandfathering status is lost. That means he would have to meet the minimum land area

requirements, which is measured in sq. feet. He asked about the number of bedrooms allowed, which is measured in gallons/day, and we told him it was whatever the state would allow based on the soil type and slope. He was told that if he could not meet the MLAR, he could get denied by the Planning Board and apply to the ZBA based on the fact that he is decreasing the degree of non-conformity. Right now, he could probably get approval for a minimum of two-bedroom houses on 9 lots, for example, tiny houses.” Vicki Garland stated she was not sure if that answered any questions. Scott Grant asked if test pits were done at all and Burke replied no. Scott Grant replied that this needs to be discussed. The question posed was that they could get 9 two-bedroom houses on those lots right now? Vicki Garland stated that this what the board is trying to avoid, it definitely is a major improvement going from 9 to 3 but they still have to follow the rules for those 3. That is the issue here- not everything is grandfathered. Michael Galante spoke up and stated that you can’t say that you can build a 4-bedroom house there without doing the groundwork. Burke York replied that they could because they have Conway water and sewer. It was stated that it did not apply and David Patch stated it does apply because they are lots of record. He explained that it is not right to take someone that has a buildable lot and turn it into a lot with no value what so ever. He spoke about lots of record and were told by legal council when the ordinance was written that they do not have to conform because they are grandfathered. Since he has been on the board if you came in with 9 lots and wanted to make them 3, we would go with whatever the state allowed. And even though we don’t allow the reduction for water and septic that would be if you were making a new development. Burke York stated he understood if he comes in with an application next month there are three options- the board could look at this and allow 4 bedrooms on the 3 merged lots as they are lots of record; the second option is we could come with this plan and the board could look at it and say they were not happy with the situation even though you are improving the situation. This would then have us apply to the ZBA for relief. The third option really as far as the owners are concerned is to get approval for each lot or the lots they want to build on and go that route- the owners really do not want to go that route. If they go this way, they will need to build a road to town standards. Burr Philips asked about the comment in the email regarding the 2 bedrooms allowed and asked if this was the merged lots? Board replied no it was not the merged lots but the original 9 lots. Burr Phillips asked regarding the email if you merge the lots then it said you have to meet the current standards. Vicki Garland replied grandfathering goes away. Burke York replied that as a lot of record the state would give them the two bedrooms. If it’s a lot of record without sewer and water and I sent in a septic design into the state of New Hampshire they would give me two bedrooms with a 1250-gallon tank. David Patch commented that if we go by what the state allows with water and sewer you could place a 3-bedroom on every lot- all nine of them. It would not look very pretty however. Pat Roberts asked if he had a lot across the street that wasn’t accessed by water and sewer, I don’t have to

conform to the minimum land area standard? David Patch stated no if it was a lot of record prior to the zoning ordinance. Pat Roberts asked if the definition of a lot of record carry forward to the new lots? Vicki Garland replied that the 9 lots of record now become 3 new lots of record. Burr Philips clarified that if you have water and sewer the state will not allow you to put any size dwelling on the lot. If you have sewer it is not part of the DES subsurface so you do not have to apply to them. If you have municipal sewer you have to apply to the municipal sewer department and then the state to make sure there is capacity. If the lot is iffy then the state will do everything they can to give you two bedrooms and that they consider reasonable use of your land because they don't want to make your land worthless. Burke York stated that prior to coming in with the application he will have a letter from North Conway Water Precinct saying they will allow us to hook up into the system with X number of bedrooms and the design between the owners and the Precinct will be line size and sewer. Joe Heuston asked if the houses to be built would be duplexes? Burke York/Dennis Egan/Megan Scheid replied no the discussion with the neighbor Frances Duffy in good faith has it has been single family homes. Scott Grant stated the board is in favor of the project however the legality and principle of it is important. The first thing to get done is that Frances Duffy needs to get the voluntary lot merger. He spoke about the worst-case scenario being a denial of the planning board the owners could go to the ZBA and ask for relief.

**4.Review and approve minutes:** March 3, 2025 and March 18, 2025. David Shedd pointed out various grammar mistakes in the March 3, 2025 minutes. Motion made by Vicki Garland seconded by Michael Galante to accept the minutes of March 3, 2025 as amended. Vote unanimous. David Shedd pointed out a grammar mistake on the March 18, 2025 minutes. Motion made by Vicki Garland seconded by Joe Heuston to accept the March 18, 2025 minutes as amended. Vote unanimous.

#### **5.Administrative Report**

- **Review of Senate and House Bills-** Information provided. Emailed to board on a regular basis. Bills that are changed or updated are listed in the email
- **Application spreadsheet-** ongoing project
- **State Representative to come to the Planning Board –** David Shedd asked the board to invite the representatives Anita Burroughs and/or Chris McAleer to come to the meeting annually to meet with the board and what will affect the town.

**6.Next meeting: Working Session April 15, 2025 if needed next public session May 5, 2025**

Motion made to adjourn by Joe Heston seconded by David Patch to adjourn. Vote unanimous to adjourn at 7:40 PM.



Board sign in  
04-07-2025.docx



Public sign in  
04-07-2025.docx

Respectfully submitted

Louise B. Burns

Planning Board/ZBA Clerk

APPROVED