

Town of Campton  
Planning Board Work Session Minutes  
September 22<sup>th</sup> 2020

**Board Attendees:** Stuart Pitts, Chair, Chris Kelly, Tim Scanlon, Floyd Wilkie, Bill Cheney, Ex-officio, and Jack Letvinchuk, Alternate

**Public Attendees:** Dan Boynton and Tara Bamford

The Planning Board opened the meeting at 6:30 PM.

First on the was correspondence. The Board determined that they were too busy with the Zoning Ordinance review and decided to start with item 2.

Next on the agenda was the review of the draft Zoning Ordinance with the Consultant to ask questions and give direction. The conversation started with the Consultant wanting general feedback on the organization of the zoning ordinance. The Board was generally happy with the organization of the Zoning Ordinance. They had no additional comments and were happy to get into the various sections of the ordinance.

The first major conversation revolved around the breaking out of two-family dwellings from multifamily dwellings. The Board asked why this distinction was made. The Consultant mentioned that in State law they commonly refer to multifamily units as having three or more dwellings in them. The Board indicated that because they do not address or treated two-family homes any different, that they would like to keep the multifamily definition as two or more.

The next major conversation was the distinction between “Municipal Waste System” and “Municipal Water System” versus the Consultant’s suggestion to replace municipal with public. The Board discussed with the Consultant their thought process behind leaving those definitions as municipal instead of public. The Consultant agreed to leave the definitions as they were for those two items.

The “Wetlands” definition had been altered and highlighted by the Consultant. The Board asked the Consultant to confirm why the changes had been made. The Board was told that the old definition used some terminology that is no longer legal. The Consultant’s language more appropriately matched how the State government defines wetlands. The Consultant also told the Board that she replaced old language “poorly drained soil” with “wetlands” and explained how the two could be legally used.

Home occupation was brought up by the Board. The Board expressed their desire to try and clarify the fact that direct family members do not count as employees. They also wanted to stress that these businesses needed to be owner occupied. The Consultant took their suggestions into consideration and promised to come up with some language for the next draft of the ordinance.

The next major question the Consultant had was room rental for Bed & Breakfast and the question of who was responsible for approval. The Consultant pointed out that in the B&B

paragraph there was a mentioned of “only in an approved” B&B. The Consultant’s question was who gave the approval. After some research the Board decided that it would be best to have the approval come from site plan review. The Consultant said she would have the language written up.

A conversation about minimum frontage started when looking at the 100-foot frontage allowed on a cul-de-sac. The Consultant asked the Board about the minimum required frontage around town. The question came up because the Consultant did not see a minimum frontage anywhere generally for the town. The Board informed the Consultant that the minimum frontage is 200 feet unless otherwise stated. She suggested that that information be included in the General section of the ordinance.

The next conversation was the Consultant determining the sign permit process. The Board walked her through the normal process about how a permit is attained. The Consultant was able to clear up some of her questions and told the Board she would clear up the wording in the ordinance. There were also a few other minor corrections and process clarifications throughout the sign section of the ordinance.

The next section that the Consultant had questions was in the Accessory Dwelling Unit section. There was some discussion about the number of bedrooms allowed in the units as well as the number of parking spaces. The Consultant told the Board that the number of bedrooms in the attached ADUs was regulated in State law. The parking was a quick conversation where the Consultant suggested to increase from 1.5 to 2 spaces, the Board agreed. The Consultant also removed the site plan review requirement for detached ADUs and explained that the Board can not require site plan review for two family homes.

The remaining topics for discussion were miscellaneous topics. The Consultant suggested to have the Penalty section align with the State statute that way the Town can raise the fine amount as the State raises it. The Consultant also offered some criteria for the ZBA to consider when they are reviewing special exceptions. This also gives citizens a better idea about what they might want to address or focus on when they are presenting their arguments to the ZBA. The Board liked these changes and said they looked forward to seeing the next draft.

The Board and Consultant discussed times and dates for the next meeting. The Consultant told the Board she would have the next draft ready by the 19<sup>th</sup> of October and the Board agreed to meet on the 26<sup>th</sup> of October at 6:30 pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Corey Davenport

Planning Board Clerk