

**Freedom Planning Board  
September 20, 2018  
Freedom Town Hall  
7:00 p.m.**

**Members Present:** Chairman Anne Cunningham, Paul Elie, Les Babb, Jeffrey Towle Dale McConkey, Peter Park(A)

**Members Absent:** Bill Elliott

**Others Present:** Jim Rines, Karl Ogren, Glenn Mcaechnie

**Quorum:** Met

With a quorum having been declared the meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with Chairman Anne Cunningham presiding. The Minutes from the last meeting were reviewed as the first order of business.

**Minutes:**

**Paul E. made a motion seconded by Dale to accept the minutes for August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting with the following amendment:** On page 1 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph from the bottom remove the duplicate word record.

Anne gave an overview of the site plan review for Camp Calumet Shore Front District and Conference Center and stated she would like to determine first if the application is complete for both the Conference Center and Shore Front District. The plat in the packet was discussed and the small addition of a dining hall that was added. Anne went to look at the site and the conditions of approval for the last application have been met. Jim Rines came before the board to begin the review for the Shore Front District.

**Calumet Shore Front Site Plan Review Plat Requirements**

- 5.1 General. A letter of intent detailing the proposed development along with a list of names and addresses of all abutters to the site, as defined by R.S.A. 672:3 as may be amended, who own property not more than five (5) days before the day of filing, as shown in the Town Records and signed by a Town Official shall be submitted to the Planning Board.
- 5.2 Site Plan Plat.
  - 5.2.1 Copies. The applicant shall submit five copies, 24+x 36+of the plat.
  - 5.2.2. Scale. The scale shall be at a minimum scale of 1-inch equals 100 feet.
  - 5.2.3. Preparation. A land surveyor, an engineer, or an architect shall prepare the plat.
  - 5.2.4. Content. The Plat shall contain the following:

	Provided	Waiver Request
1) A location plan at a minimum scale of one inch equals one thousand feet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• showing property lines of parcels being developed in relation to surrounding areas;</li> <li>• names and locations of town streets; names and locations of proposed streets;</li> <li>• names of water courses and water bodies on and adjacent to the site;</li> <li>• and area of the entire parcel in acres and square feet.</li> </ul>	Sheet 2 &3	

2) A title block with title; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>owners name and address;</li> <li>name of agent;</li> <li>scale of plan; and</li> <li>name, seal, and address of preparer.</li> </ul>	Sheet 1-4 Name address and seal	
3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North arrow and</li> <li>bar scale.</li> </ul>	Sheet 1-4	
4) Surveyed property lines of the parcel showing their bearings and distances.	Sheet 3	
5) Names of all abutting property owners, showing book and page as shown in the Carroll County Registry	Sheet 1&3	
6) Location and layout of existing and proposed structures and buildings.	Sheet 3 & 4	
7) Existing and proposed contours at five-foot intervals for the entire site being considered for development. Where grade is proposed, existing contours shall be dotted lines and finished elevations solid.	Sheet 4	Waiver requested is consistent with Camp Cody, Camp Huckins and Camp Robin Hood. <b>Jeff made a motion Seconded by Paul O. to grant a waiver for 5.2.4.7 Motion passed unanimously.</b>
8) Area of entire parcel in acres and square feet.	Upper rt. hand corner of sh. 3	
9) Zoning and special district boundaries.	Upper rt. hand corner sh. 3	
10) Deed reference and tax map number.	Sh. 3	
11) Location width, curbing and paving of access ways, egress ways, and streets within the site.	Sh. 3 & 4	
12) Location and layout of all on-site parking and loading facilities.	Sh. 3 & 4	
13) Location and size of all municipal and non-municipal utilities and appurtenances including: water, sewer, electric, telephone, gas lines, and fire alarm connections, indicating whether overhead or underground, and the locations of well and septic systems.	Sh.4	
14) Type and location of solid waste disposal facilities.	Sh. 4	
15) Location, elevation, and layout of catch basins and other surface drainage features.	No catch basins	
16) Location of all physical/natural features including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>water bodies,</li> </ul>	Sheet 4 and 3	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• water courses,</li> <li>• wetlands,</li> <li>• vegetation/foliage lines,</li> <li>• soil types,</li> <li>• railroads,</li> <li>• rock outcroppings, and</li> <li>• stone walls.</li> </ul>	Sheet 4 has the most details.	
17) Dimensions and area of all property to be dedicated for public use of common ownership.	N/A	
18) For all site plans that involve and designated as %Special Flood Hazard Areas+(SFHA) by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) assure all necessary permits required under Federal or State law, including Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, 33 U.S.C. 1334.	Sheet 4	
19) For site plans that involve land designated as %Special Flood Hazard Areas+(SFHA) by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), proposals for development of greater than fifty (50) lots or five (5) acres (whichever is the lesser), must include Base Flood Elevation (BFE) data (i.e., floodplain boundary and 100-year flood elevation).	Sheet 4  Flood plain note in upper rt. hand corner of sh.3	
20) Date and permit number of all required state and federal permits.	Permit by notification note on upper right-hand corner for shoreland sh.3 is pending.	
21) Location of all buildings, wells, and leach fields within one hundred and fifty feet of the parcel.		Waiver request utilities are shown in the area and are far removed from any property boundaries. <b>Dale made a motion, seconded by Paul E. to grant a waiver for 5.4.2.21 motion passed unanimously.</b>
22) Dimensions, area, and minimum setback requirements on all existing and proposed lots.	Sheet 3 upper rt corner and	

	shoreline setback on sheet 4	
23) Proposed landscaping including size and type of plant material.	N/A	
24) Pedestrian walks providing circulation through the site.	Sheet 3 and where they show up on sheet 4	
25) Location and size of proposed and existing signs, walls, and fences.	N/A	
26) Location, widths, and purposes of any easement or right-of-way.	No easement of record noted	
27) Total on-site square footage of impervious surfaces.	Upper rt hand corner sheet 3	
28) Snow storage requirements.	Shown on sheet 4 shaded area	

5.3 Additional Plats. The Board can require additional plats if necessary. Examples of additional plats are as follows: *Erosion Control Plan, Landscape Plan, Building Elevation Plan, and Profiles and cross-sections on roadways and bridges*

5.4 Graphic Presentation. The Board can require the applicant to provide photo simulation, photomontage, or drawings that depict the built conditions of the site.

5.5. Additional Documentation. At the request of the Board additional documents may be required. Examples of additional documentation include: *Drainage studies, Traffic studies, Wetland studies, and Environmental, and fiscal impact studies.*

Anne asked Jim to give an overview of the proposed projects.

With the aid of a map and plat Jim explained the proposal for the chapel and the need to make it more efficient.

In the proposal for the dining area they would like to widen the loading dock by 4x 35qlong to Remove the refrigerator from the conference center to outside like on the lake side dining. In the Conference center they are proposing a roof over the patio that is existing and filling in some of the space on the first floor with office space and a stairwell to the second floor where there would be a lounge/meeting room and a stairwell and a relocation of one of the units on the second floor. Because this lot is larger than five acres in size there is no expansion of use, this application is for Improved facilities. They have a state approved operation approval so there is no need for septic design, but one will be needed for the chapel that will be tied into the existing water system for the camp.



		<b>Paul O for 5.2.4.7 motion passed unanimously.</b>
8) Area of entire parcel in acres and square feet.	Lower rt corner sh. 1	
9) Zoning and special district boundaries.	Lower rt corner sh. 1	
10) Deed reference and tax map number.	Sh. 1 lower rt. corner	
11) Location width, curbing and paving of access ways, egress ways, and streets within the site.	Sh. 1	
12) Location and layout of all on-site parking and loading facilities.	Sh. 1 & 2	
13) Location and size of all municipal and non-municipal utilities and appurtenances including: water, sewer, electric, telephone, gas lines, and fire alarm connections, indicating whether overhead or underground, and the locations of well and septic systems.	Sh. 1 & 2	
14) Type and location of solid waste disposal facilities.		
15) Location, elevation, and layout of catch basins and other surface drainage features.	No catch basins	
16) Location of all physical/natural features including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• water bodies,</li> <li>• water courses,</li> <li>• wetlands,</li> <li>• vegetation/foilage lines,</li> <li>• soil types,</li> <li>• railroads,</li> <li>• rock outcroppings, and</li> <li>• stone walls.</li> </ul>	1 & 2	
17) Dimensions and area of all property to be dedicated for public use of common ownership.	N/A	
18) For all site plans that involve and designated as %Special Flood Hazard Areas+(SFHA) by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) assure all necessary permits required under Federal or State law, including Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, 33 U.S.C. 1334.	Note on Sh.1 mid way on rt. side	
19) For site plans that involve land designated as %Special Flood Hazard Areas+(SFHA) by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), proposals for development of greater than fifty (50) lots or five (5) acres (whichever is the lesser), must include Base Flood Elevation (BFE) data (i.e., floodplain boundary and 100-year flood elevation).	Sh.1	
20) Date and permit number of all required state and federal permits.	Sh. 1 note will need sewer disposal for chapel pending	
21) Location of all buildings, wells, and leach fields within one		<b>Waiver request</b>

hundred and fifty feet of the parcel.		<b>Les made a motion, seconded by Jeff to grant waiver for 5.2.4.21 motion passed unanimously</b>
22) Dimensions, area, and minimum setback requirements on all existing and proposed lots.	Lower rt hand corner sh. 1	
23) Proposed landscaping including size and type of plant material.	n/a	
24) Pedestrian walks providing circulation through the site.	Sh. 1 & where visible on sh. 2	
25) Location and size of proposed and existing signs, walls, and fences.	n/a	
26) Location, widths, and purposes of any easement or right-of-way.	No easements proposed	
27) Total on-site square footage of impervious surfaces.	Sh. 1	
28) Snow storage requirements.	Sh. 1 does not show in the blow-up area.	

5.3 Additional Plats. The Board can require additional plats if necessary. Examples of additional plats are as follows: *Erosion Control Plan, Landscape Plan, Building Elevation Plan, and Profiles and cross-sections on roadways and bridges*

5.4 Graphic Presentation. The Board can require the applicant to provide photo simulation, photomontage, or drawings that depict the built conditions of the site.

5.5. Additional Documentation. At the request of the Board additional documents may be required. Examples of additional documentation include: *Drainage studies, Traffic studies, Wetland studies, and Environmental, and fiscal impact studies.*

**Anne made a motion, seconded by Peter to accept the application as complete accept for the three items in 5.2.4.14 putting the solid waste disposal on the plan and 5.2.4.20 the permit by notification for lot 5 and the sewage disposal for the chapel on lot 4. Motion passed unanimously.**

DESIGN STANDARDS AND REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS-Go through these is application is accepted as complete.

6.1. Architectural 6.1.1. Building Height	Jim handed out plan the easterly and north view of the chapel and plans for the conference center. Les asked if the chapel is sprinkled. Karl answered it is not. Discussion ensued around the design of the chapel.  Paul O asked if the fire chief will be consulted. Karl has had contact with the fire chief for the existing structures and can imagine that he would not be talking to him again throughout the process. He is required to do a walk through every year. Les has it as a note for a condition of approval to have it looked at.
6.2. Bridge and Road Construction	n/a
6.3. Sedimentation and Erosion Control	Site is flat and very pores
6.4. Storm Water Drainage.	Infiltration trenches will infiltrate 100 % of the stormwater runoff for a 50-year flood. Computations have been provided.
6.5. Flood Hazard Plan	N/A not in flood zone
6.6. Water Quality	No new wells
6.7. Dust, Fumes, Vapors, Gases, and Odors.	n/a
6.8 Glare	n/a
6.9. Noise	n/a
6.10.Sewage	Has been addressed in conditions.
6.11. Utilities	The chapel will tie into the existing water system and will also tie into existing electric underground.
6.12 Lighting	Nothing more than outdoor lights
6.13. Signs	n/a
6.14. Equipment and Service Areas	No change all existing
6.15. Parking	No change
6.16. Access Management and Multi-modal.	n/a
6.17. Landscaping.	No proposed landscaping
6.18. Fencing, Walls, and Buffers	Nothing proposed

### Public hearing open at 7:55

Mark McConkey stated he lives a quarter of a mile down the road from Calumet and fully supports their project.

Glen Mcaechnie is a neighbor as well and supports the project.

### Public hearing closed at 7:57

### Les made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions:

- All aspects of these improvements meet all local, state and federal laws and their requirements, i.e., fire marshal.
- All exterior lighting be downward facing.
- Receive their permit by notification
- Septic approval

- **Show solid waste disposal at the Conference Center**

**Anne asked about the fire requirements, Les responded it is covered in all aspects of these improvements meet all local, state and federal laws and their requirements.**

**Anne added, i.e. fire marshal to local, state and federal laws for clarification.**

**Peter seconded the motion; Motion passed unanimously.**

**Discussion for site plan review ended at 7:59 p.m. and Jim Rines and Glen Mcaechnie left the meeting.**

### **Joint Meeting with ZBA**

**Chairman Scott Lees, John Krebs and, Janice Zecher entered the meeting at 8:02 p.m.**

Anne welcomed the ZBA board members to the meeting and stated after talking to Janice; she suggested the following topics for discussion:

- Village setbacks
- Tree cutting on a lot with grade 12% or greater
- Possibly introducing wording for one dwelling lot

Scott Lees opened the discussion explaining one of the things the board talked about were the setback requests for the Village, Square Brook, and Mountain View. Mountain View comes up a lot for setback requests because of the size of the lots. They are very small, and with the current setbacks make it challenging. The village District came up recently and, none of the buildings in the Village District and their location to the road come close to meeting the requirements. There is a feeling that maybe this should be discussed, if someone wanted to add a building with the current ordinance, it would have to be far away from existing structures.

Anne asked how often the issue comes up with setbacks, the feeling was it happens a lot with Mountain View, Square Brook has slowed down, and it does not often happen in the Village District.

Cutting of trees on a lot with the grade of 12% in the Shore Front District is another topic for discussion. The way the ordinance reads now anything within 75 feet is looked at, and anything greater than 12% is supposed to be looked at by the zoning board. The interpretation of the intent of the ordinance was discussed. Karl clarified the question is because people have a small section that is greater than 12% does that open up the whole lot to be looked at for their trees or is it just the little area greater than 12%.

Anne read the ordinance. Discussion ensued around looking at what other towns do because this is something the ZBA sees a lot of.

The last issue discussed was a lot of record (one dwelling per lot). Zoning Officer Don Harris would like to have some language that clarifies section 310 lot of record in the zoning ordinance that states there is only one dwelling allowed on a lot of record. Anne handed out the existing ordinance and discussion ensued. Don proposed the following language:

The lot of record may have only one single family dwelling on a lot of record as defined by Section 1902, Number 18 in the definitions section.

ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Unit) were discussed and what is allowed by state law and if the proposed language is clear.

To better clarify the ordinance, it was suggested maybe the proposed change should read any lot of record shall not be used for more than one single family detached dwelling on a lot. Karl suggested using the word unattached.

The 50 plus housing was discussed and that it doesn't fit the above definition.

Anne suggested proposing the language to read *one single family dwelling as the primary residence then add where ever ADUs are allowed they are allowed because by definition they are accessory, not primary*. Les suggested adding a footnote *unless another use is permitted in this ordinance*.

The next step is to get Don's input on the language.

Nonconforming structures was discussed next. The current ordinance states you can't go above the roofline without a variance. John Krebs suggested not changing the ordinance because it is not something they see a lot of. Replacement vs. expansion was discussed.

The discussion went back to setbacks.

The challenges with the setbacks for the Village District, Mountain View and, Square Brook was discussed and how the lot sizes are treated. Anne asked the ZBA to prioritize the three areas in regard to the number of applications and time, ZBA responded it would be Mountain View, Square Brook, and the Village. John Krebs thought for aesthetics purposes the Village would be the priority.

Mark McConkey handed out information regarding other ordinances regarding village setbacks. After a brief discussion on setbacks, Mark asked the board to consider increasing lot coverage to 15%. Currently lot coverage is 10%.

### **Mark McConkey left the meeting at 8:45 p.m.**

Conversation ensued around lot coverage.

Karl stated that currently the lot coverage is 20% for impervious and 10% of that can be roofed; decks and steps are not part of the 10% calculation. This change was made last year to relax the rule. Discussion ensued around square footage and the pros and cons of going to 20% lot coverage.

Discussion went back to a lot with a 12% grade.

Les suggested if the 12% sloped area exceeds the square footage of 75-foot setback under 12% then you don't have to go to ZBA. Discussion ensued around Les's suggestion and back to village setbacks.

### **The Joint meeting ended, and ZBA left the meeting at 9:09 p.m.**

### **Public Hearing for Changes to Freedom Subdivision Regulations**

There was no public present for the hearing.

Anne explained to Les the changes and the addition of the electronic map. After discussion around if buildings should be shown on a plat for mergers the board voted.

**Jeff made motion, seconded by Dale to accept the changes to the Subdivision Regulations as presented. Motion passed unanimously.**

Public meeting closed at 9:29 p.m.

**Master Plan**

Anne suggested a workshop meeting to work on the Master Plan recommendations. It was decided to have a workshop on October 11<sup>th</sup> at 7:15 p.m., Anne will email the plan out to everyone.

There being no other business to come before the board, Peter made a motion, seconded by Jeff to adjourn the meeting at 9:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Stacy Bolduc  
Recording Secretary