

## PLANNING BOARD

MARCH 18, 2021

## MEMORIAL BUILDING

7:00 P.M.

*The following are to be considered draft minutes until approved by the Board.*

Present in the meeting room: Darrin Patten, Michael Howard, Ken Jacques, Tim Bray, and Alternate Dan Saulnier. Whit Smith, Zoning Coordinator. Absent: Bryan O'Day.

Present via ZOOM: Member Peter Keene, Alex Belenz, Circuit Rider from Upper Valley Planning Commission, B. Manning, and Andy D'Amico.

Congratulations extended to Tim Bray for his election to the Board and to Ken Jacques for his reelection.

Darrin, as the longest standing member on the Board opened the meeting began at 7:00 p.m.

Election of Officers:

Chairman: Peter Keene and Mike Howard were asked if they were interested, and they were not. Tim Bray was asked if he would be willing, and he agreed.

Ken Jacques moved to nominate Tim as Chairman, and Peter Keene as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Mike. Dan was asked to fill for absent board member. The Board voted in favor of the nominations.

Minutes of February 18, 2021: Cloutier Consult: Page two replace 6.5 and 5.5 with 5.6 respectively. *There are ~~6.5~~ 5.6 acres with 275 feet of road frontage. They would like to put a small single-story duplex on the property. The Board reviewed the proposal and the tax map for the property. The lot is ~~5.5~~ 5.6 acres.*

Tanner Jacques Consult Page two add the word "he" : *so, if they wanted to convert it he could.*

Page 4 last paragraph: *the Board decided it could not be subdivided, according to Mrs. McDowall, but a second unit could be built on that.* Strike the comma between subdivided and according to Mrs. McDowall.

Page 5 first paragraph: *property but once they backed the wetlands out it was way undersized,* Add the word out.

Ken moved to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Darrin, and unanimously approved.

Whit reported Mrs. McDowall was informed by a member of the Planning Board that a second dwelling could be built on her property. There is additional data coming to light that will be available soon.

Merger Application: Bob and Donna Ruel want to put a generator behind their house. They have two small non-conforming lots and want to merge. They are also merging the small lot that is lake frontage. Reviewed and Tim signed the application.

The following is an e-mail communication, as written, submitted by Whit for the Board to review:

Matters for CONSIDERATION

SPRINGFIELD, NH, Planning Board

March 18, 2021

RON SLAYTON – FFL

Hello,

My name is Ron Slayton Jr. you received an email from Karen at the ATF regarding my FFL license.

I have an online dealer website for ammunition and accessories, I am getting my FFL license to be able to be able to have firearms sales, as far as traffic and a home based business I have a room that is part of my garage that I am making for inventory and storage of items to sell, I am not excepting much traffic to this location, It will be by appointment only or meeting at a delivery location (depending on what is being sold) I will send some items by mail as well, I have already been fingerprinted and background checked through the chief of police in Grantham and all my business and FFL paperwork through the state has been done What do I need to do moving forward for the town?

Thank you

Whit reported he was contacted by ATF who are considering the application and they wanted to know if there was anything required in the Town of Springfield. Whit responded it sounds like could be a home business or commercial activity and therefore a Site Plan Review would be required. The agent stated she would notify that applicant and a few minutes later he received the e-mail above. The address is 192 Town Farm Road Extension.

Ken reported when Peter Crowell did the same thing, the ATF had certain requirements for security and lighting etc. He suggested pulling the file to see what was required. Tim stated he looked at it in terms of a home occupation or home business. There may be an overlay of regulations. Whit stated the Planning Board should decide whether it needs a site plan review or not. The Board discussed many possible scenarios and what this involved. The Board agreed they would like to have Mr. Slayton come before the Board for a consultation.

Whit reported he received a series of e-mails from Brandt Denniston who is also joining on ZOOM. There are suggestions regarding drafting of ordinances, procedures for completing and considering applications.

BRANDT DENNISTON – Suggestions for Drafting Ordinances, Zoning Procedures, Forms on Town Website  
Email excerpts (*verbatim*):

Reading the recent minutes of BoS gave me the idea to look something up. The linked article was pretty good but not complete in addressing your concerns.

I have read many times that you press for a consistent process in dealing with zoning ordinance matters. I attempted to flow chart the zoning ordinance but gave up.

Quality control of processes were what I spent years programming.  
I always start creating a process with a mission statement of 25 words or less and then build goals that when reached will in total accomplish the mission.

I have quality checks for each process input and each process output. The inputs are the process “suppliers” and the process outputs are the process “customers”. There are little “c” customers and big “C” customers. The little “c” customers are part of the process and have a sub-process role to provide an input as a supplier. (GIGO) comes into play when these happen so there has to be quality checks for both outputs and inputs throughout the process steps. To accomplish consistent handling there is a need to have a “definable, repeatable process”.

Workflows can be diagrammed and/automated.

When you made mention of property deed review it got me thinking about inputs that may be needed for certain types of zoning ordinance reviews. The mission statement would dictate what types of inputs would be needed to start the process. The quality checks would include “review the deed” if the mission was to approve a property wall. Etc.

Brandt Denniston  
603.309.7007

Zoning Coordinator reply:

Mr. Denniston,

Thank you for contacting me. While I am not sure what you are proposing (are you selling services?), I am forwarding your message to members of the town Planning Board (and other interested parties), which is responsible for drafting and updating our Land Use Ordinances. You are absolutely correct - I am looking for consistency.

However, I think the mention of property deed review in the minutes is out of context. I will be addressing this (and other poorly worded notes) at the next meeting of the Select Board.

I appreciate your interest and willingness to help here.

All the best,

Thank you for your response. I'm retired, not selling.

In this day and age I would think that a landowner would be able to go to the town webpage and get a guide for a site plan review, a special exception and/or a variance that is an AI based application that identifies the "mission" and prompts the applicant with "requirement" questions and provides space for answers as the applicant goes through the process from end to end before going to the planning board. The "requirement" questions would come from the zoning ordinance as a dropdown list and would be red-starred as a required field. The answers such as distance from the property line would have to be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance or trigger the need for a special exception or a variance. Etc. using AI.

The town webpage for Site Plan Reviews has a document typed on a manual typewriter.

When I setup the first website for the town I also setup a list-serve to communicate news, agendas and minutes. I proofread and grammar checked them before sending them out. If they failed I sent them back.

Zoning Coordinator reply:

I agree with you. AI may be a bit out of our budget, but there is much room for improvement. Until recently, there was not a standard set of criteria for site plan review. I do use searchable files and forms in portable document format.

This is a possibility for programming an online process for the planning board and for the ZBA. He works for D-H programming online education for the medical staff.

I would think that an engagement would be conducted in three steps: 1. Review the ordinances for fact-based statements and suggestions for rewriting the ordinances so that consistency of decisions is achievable. 2. Review the draft ordinances for usability as a definable, repeatable process and that it would be programmable. 3. Program the processes.

I got interrupted. Would it be possible to get a grant for the programming engagement?  
It may be useful for other small towns in similar situations

Zoning Coordinator reply:

Mr. Denniston,

I will be attending the town Planning Board meeting this evening. I will present your ideas and suggestions to them.

Tim asked Mr. Denniston to give an overview of what he is thinking and how it could help the Town. Mr. Denniston reviewed the above data in detail relative to creating a definable, repeatable process, and subprocesses, with validation of application information against a database of property and property owners through automation and artificial intelligence programs. Mr. Denniston suggested creating flow charts to assist with education of the process.

gather data and information and to assist them in the application process. This seems to be a good fit and approach for this town right now. It sounds like a good system if it were used in conjunction with revising or constructing an ordinance. To create such a system and to create and maintain such a database would exceed the amount of work required for the few applications the Planning Board deals with. The personal attention applicants are given is of benefit to the nature of the town. Being able to keep such an automated system updated is important to consider with changing staff and situations. It is important to keep in mind the ability to assist the residents versus needing to maintain an automated system.

Tim thanked Mr. Denniston for the interest in the town. If there are additional ideas, the Board welcomes input. The Board admires and appreciates his impressive background. At this time, it might be premature for the town.

Twin Lake Villa: Ken reported as discussed at the last meeting for the overview of Twin Lake Villa's site, the key on the buildings to identify which ones were year-round buildings has been adjusted and made to the file. The other was how to access the property cards which is in the file.

McGraw: Ken asked for clarification on the process for Josh McGraw. From the discussion at his consultation, it was suggested Josh calculate the soils and slope subtracting the wetlands and pond to see how much land he needed. The issue went to Zoning and Josh stipulated the lot did not meet the land criteria for two dwelling units and the Zoning Board granted it. If someone is unable to make the calculations, there is a mechanism in the Zoning Ordinance that allows for a professional to do it. The Laurie's did that for their property on Hogg Hill and they had enough land for the two dwelling units. Ken reviewed the Rego/Cole file to see what was there. They had a residence, and it appears they were running the catering out of the residence initially, and then moved to the barn to have more space, with facilities upstairs. It seems that the number could be run, whether someone stipulates it or not. The process is to run the numbers and the requirement is on the applicant to run that. His concern is now there is a Special Exception on a piece of property that might not need it. Whit stated Mr. McGraw as a property owner decided decision to apply to the Board of Adjustment for a Special Exception to allow a second dwelling unit and the ZBA heard the case. There was a lot of discussion about how much relief they were granting the question of relief does not come in to it. It is whether a second dwelling unit should be permitted based on available data. No one in the room was qualified to determine the calculations and rather than go through all that, the applicant proceeded with the stipulation that the property did not support two dwelling units and therefore his request for a Special Exception.

Tim noted he listened to some of the hearing, and Josh stipulated the property did not meet it so he is saying that even if he ran the slopes, he does not believe it would make it. He can do that. He is asking for relief from the zoning board. The board was not able to do the calculations. He expected the ZBA would stipulate since they did not know what the amount should be, they would require the applicant to get those calculations and then come back to the ZBA. That did

Ken asked if there is a next step in this case for Mr. McGraw in front of the Planning Board.

Ken recalled there had been a requirement for Bryan O'Day to come back to Planning. Whit stated Bryan came to the Planning Board seeking an answer, and there was a lack of clarity with respect to the actual size of the lot and whether it would support two dwelling unit. At that Bryan filed for a Special Exception also on the assumption the lot would not support two-units. Bryan came back with a survey plan and did not have enough land. Whit stated this is an area the Boards will probably be seeing more and more and this is where if the Board had a consistent approach both boards and applicants would benefit. The Board discussed the process that took place at the consultation. Concern was expressed why have the regulation if it is not going to be followed to determine actual requirements. The applicant should get to the point where they know what they have and what they need.

The Board further discussed the process that took place with the Zoning case. Members noted their concern with precedent.

Tim noted the issue appears to be a relationship between Planning and Zoning and quantifying the regulation as the Planning Board has. Whit stated that was discussed as some length at the Zoning Board meeting. A discussion with both boards on the zoning ordinance to review the lot sizing article was suggested. Tim stated he would speak to Susan Chiarella to get her thoughts on the matter.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Submitted by,

Janet Roberts,  
Administrative Assistant

DRAFT