

CONWAY PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

MARCH 25, 2021

PAGES

1	Appointment of Alternate Member
1	Review and Acceptance of Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• March 11, 2021 – Adopted as Written
1	Viewpoint North Conway, LLC (File #FR21-01) – Full Site Plan Review Continued (PID 202-168) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continued until August 26, 2021
10	Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Barry Richard Connolly and Jennifer A. Connolly – Lot Merger (PID 298-46 & 47)

CONWAY PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

MARCH 25, 2021

A meeting of the Conway Planning Board was held on Thursday, March 25, 2021 beginning at 7:01 pm at the Conway Town Office in Conway, NH. Those present were: Chair, Steven Hartmann; Selectmen's Representative, Steven Porter; Vice Chair, Benjamin Colbath; Secretary, Sarah Frechette; Bill Barbin; Ailie Byers; Alternate, Ray Shakir; Planning Director, Thomas Irving; and Planning Assistant, Holly Meserve. Peter Malia, Town Counsel, of Hastings Law Firm; and alternate, Steven Steiner, were in attendance.

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERANTE MEMBER

Mr. Hartmann appointed Mr. Shakir as a voting member.

REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Mr. Colbath made a motion, seconded by Ms. Byers, to approve the Minutes of March 11, 2021 as written. Motion carried unanimously.

VIEWPOINT NORTH CONWAY, LLC (FILE #FR21-01) – FULL SITE PLAN REVIEW CONTINUED (PID 202-168)

Josh McAllister of HEB Engineers and John Ratigen of Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella appeared before the Board. This is an application to demolish the existing motel and site features and construct a 105,836 square foot, 4-story, 105-room hotel with associated infrastructure. This application was continued from February 11, 2021 and February 25, 2021.

Mr. McAllister asked how would the Board like to proceed. Mr. Hartmann stated he will open the meeting and hear from the people who filed the complaint. Roy Tilsley of Bernstein Shur stated he is representing Michael and Eliza Grant who are one of the neighbors/abutters who have filed a nuisance complaint pursuant to §110-39 of the site plan review regulations. Mr. Tilsley stated that section allows this Board to place reasonable restrictions on site design to prevent or reduce a serious nuisance to the abutters and the public.

Mr. Tilsley stated this property is located in the Intervale neighborhood; the size and scale of the proposed hotel, in this area so close to a residential neighborhood, simply does not fit to where it is being proposed. Mr. Tilsley stated it is too much, too big and it's too close. Mr. Tilsley stated we are asking the Board to find that the project as proposed is a nuisance and we are asking that the Board impose additional restrictions on site design in order to alleviate that nuisance.

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

Mr. Tilsley stated the Board has an extensive nuisance complaint that was submitted four weeks ago; that document is the work of the neighborhood. Mr. Tilsley stated in that document the neighborhood has come up with specific accommodations; we are not here to say over my dead body this can never happen, we just don't want to have a project that is too big, too much and too close. Mr. Tilsley stated we are proposing things that we think this Board has authority to do once found as a nuisance that will allow the project to continue on an appropriate scale for the neighborhood.

Mike Specht stated he is a resident of Mountain View Estates and President of the Board. Mr. Specht stated as an abutter we are greatly impacted, if not the most impacted, by this proposal. Mr. Specht stated we have listed many items that will affect us and affect our day to day lives that we hope the Board will take into consideration and be able to scale back the project. Mr. Specht stated with a building of that size with that many units there will be a lot of people coming in and out, which is going to give a lot of noise with cars coming in and out and people talking in the parking lot. Mr. Specht stated as direct abutters that noise will carry into our property.

Mr. Specht stated they are going to have lights in the parking lot which will be shining into our property, and then at four-stories tall there will be lights from above shining down onto our properties. Mr. Specht stated there will be people in those windows above looking down so there are privacy concerns. Mr. Specht stated the driveway into our complex is on Intervale Crossroads approximately 100-feet from one of the proposed driveways for this development, which is going to make getting out onto Intervale Crossroads that much more difficult. Mr. Specht stated it is a busy cut-through already and there is the post office.

Mr. Specht stated we are concerned that the traffic is going to increase, and it is going to be worse for us to get to our property. Mr. Specht stated there is going to be a lot more pedestrian traffic with people trying to cross Route 16 to get to the scenic overlook. Mr. Specht stated there is going to be a lot more foot traffic in our area which will complicate the vehicular traffic.

Mr. Specht stated we do like our views and it is one of the things we paid for when we purchased our properties and losing those is going to have an adverse effect on our property values in addition to having a four-story building that is right beside us. Mr. Specht stated every complaint listed in the nuisance complaint directly affects us on a day-by-day basis. Mr. Specht stated we are asking the Board to consider the neighborhood, consider that this building is not in character with the neighborhood, and its size is not in character with the neighborhood; it is already a busy area and this is going to make it worse and make it a difficult place to live if it goes through.

Eliza Grant of Balcony Seat View Road stated she would like to address the restaurant/lounge that is proposed. Ms. Grant stated sheet 18 of the buildings site plan clearly states Hotel and Restaurant and sheet 5, general note 18, states that the restaurant and lounge is for hotel guests use only, but a restaurant is a business and it cannot discriminate who can enter that business and what their qualifications are for doing that. Ms. Grant stated in additions it is not practical or realistic that this hotel is going to regulate the restaurant based on their guests.

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

Ms. Grant stated there is no precedent, generally or in the Valley, for calling a free breakfast, a continental breakfast or even a sit-down breakfast at a B & B, a restaurant or a lounge. Ms. Grant stated she has looked up most of the hotels located on Route 16 with a continental or free breakfast and they do not list themselves as having a restaurant on their website. Ms. Grant stated local B & B's who offer food just to their guests are not listed as restaurants.

Ms. Grant stated as neighbors we are opposed to a restaurant or a lounge as it will inevitably increase traffic, noise pollution, light pollution and other nuisances that are clearly laid out in our complaint, but there is also the obvious concern of having more drivers, potentially drunk, to what is already a very dangerous stretch of road and dangerous intersection.

Ms. Grant stated the driveway permit that has been applied for with the State is listed as a hotel, not a hotel and restaurant. Ms. Grant stated we believe this is an effort to skirt the rules for parking and other site plan requirements for a restaurant or lounge, which are not to our knowledge accommodated for in this plan.

Ms. Grant stated if Viewpoint is going to provide inhouse guest food services only it is not a restaurant and the plans should reflect that. Ms. Grant stated they should not be able to pursue a liquor license or other restaurant specific permitting unless they are going to follow all of the site plan regulations for those things. Ms. Grant stated for this reason alone it seems that this site plan is inappropriate. Ms. Grant stated we are asking for additional mitigations with our very reasonable nuisance concerns.

Courtney Wrigley of Neighbor's Row stated she would like to remind all of us here that the Planning Board is an organized group of selected members of the community in charge of carrying out the future needs, wants and vision for the community. Ms. Wrigley stated this is not about special interest being voted on the Board, like real estate representatives; this is you as residents engaging and listening to us as residents and working with the developer.

Ms. Wrigley stated this is about neighborhood safety and the character of Intervale, first and foremost. Ms. Wrigley stated she strongly feels for the Mountain View condominiums as abutters as they are going to be affected the most, but this is a neighborhood issue. Ms. Wrigley stated she is not a direct abutter yet from her top floor she may be able to see this development peeking out.

Ms. Wrigley stated the Master Plan says this is how we want to grow and develop as a Town, no one is arguing that the zoning ordinance allows you to go up to 55-feet, but that does not say that every development that is proposed has to or will be given that 55-foot height. Ms. Wrigley stated it is a terrible oversight that we are in this position with a Planning Board and paid staff by the Town residents that we have not rectified this and she hopes we can do so together moving forward.

Ms. Wrigley stated it is really offensive to us as neighborhood residents from that first meeting that there was that feeling and put out there pretty quickly and strongly of a threat of lawsuit if the Board does not rubber stamp approve this. Ms. Wrigley stated the Planning Board process is an iterative process, you have been through this before but this is the process and we are at a critical juncture for our Town and extreme development pressure.

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

Ms. Wrigley stated you have a pathway forward; we are reasonably asking as residents to have our nuisance complaint acknowledged. Ms. Wrigley stated we understand that this is going to be redeveloped as a hotel, we are not looking to say no development we are just asking for a reasonable development that fits within the character of this neighborhood.

Ms. Wrigley stated even if this is a smaller development, which she hopes we can get there, she will also be asking that the Board consider the traffic and pedestrian implications and consider sidewalks. Ms. Wrigley stated when we bought our house, we did not purposely buy on the end of the strip where there is now a five-story hotel because that is not a mixed residential commercial area, that is the strip and we all know where it is.

Ms. Wrigley stated if we start to develop the same five-story hotel on one end of Route 16 all the way down to the beginning hotel that is now there we have lost the definition of Conway; we bought into north of the village of North Conway, we love Intervale and we hope to see something developed that fits in the neighborhood.

Bryant Etheridge of Dinsmore Road stated he would like to address traffic safety concerns and four areas that make that stretch of Route 16 dangerous. Mr. Etheridge stated there are two distinct curves in the road approaching the Scenic Vista from the south, it first bends to the northeast before coming back to the northwest. Mr. Etheridge stated there is really no other stretch on Route 16 from Albany to Glen where it does that and as a result the site lines are terrible; anyone turning left from Intervale Crossroads going south on Route 16 knows that, and anyone who turns left off Route 16 southbound onto Intervale Crossroads knows that.

Mr. Etheridge stated when you are headed south on Route 16 and want to make a left onto Intervale Crossroads you cannot actually get into the center turn lane until you are almost at Intervale Crossroads because you can't see where the car headed northbound trying to make a left-hand turn into the Scenic Vista is in the center lane. Mr. Etheridge stated this is how bad the site lines are in this area, and he doesn't think there is another stretch like it in the Town. Mr. Etheridge stated there is nothing that can be done about that short of obliterating the Scenic Vista and straightening out Route 16; that is how the road is.

Mr. Etheridge stated it is hilly; approaching from the south the road dips quite a bit and that effects your site line; you see this when you are trying to make a left off Intervale Crossroads and trying to make a left onto Intervale Crossroads heading southbound. Mr. Etheridge stated another thing that makes it a unique and dangerous stretch of road is that there are three roads entering all from the same direction, all from the east, in essentially one-quarter mile; Intervale Crossroads, Hurricane Mountain Road and Route 16A in Bartlett. Mr. Etheridge stated these are not dead-end roads, they are road with significant traffic.

Mr. Etheridge stated there is an active rail line, and there was an incident this summer where one of the attendants had to push a car off the rail line to avoid being hit by a train that was coming. Mr. Etheridge stated this is a unique stretch of highway, and exceptionally dangerous. Mr. Etheridge stated unfortunately we don't have to wonder if it is dangerous, in the space of eleven years there have been three fatal accidents in the immediate vicinity of Hurricane Mountain Road; one fatal car accident, one fatal bicyclist accident and one fatal pedestrian accident.

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

Mr. Etheridge stated we believe it is a dangerous stretch of road and adding traffic volume with roughly 600% intensification of the use of that lot will clearly and inevitably do; we don't have to wonder what the consequences of that will be. Mr. Etheridge stated in regard to the driveway permit we believe it should be moved from a minor permitting process to a major permitting process based on the traffic thresholds that requires for a major driveway permit as well as the dangerous nature of the highway.

Mr. Tilsley stated nuisance is not defined in the site plan review regulations; case law defines a private nuisance as resulting in an unreasonable interference with the use and enjoyment of another's property. Mr. Tilsley stated public nuisance is defined by case law as an unreasonable interference with the health, safety, peace, comfort or convenience of the general community.

Mr. Tilsley referred to a case with the NH Supreme Court, Heston vs. Ousler, 119 NH 58, which was a nuisance case that dealt with a dock on Lake Winnepesaukee. Mr. Tilsley stated the defendant in that case, the person accused of creating a nuisance, moved the dock right to the property line of his abutter, increased the size of the dock, increased the use of the dock and did it in a way that the abutter essentially lost their view of the lake. Mr. Tilsley stated it created a situation with the abutter that they could not use their beach because it was dangerous to swim in front of the abutters house.

Mr. Tilsley stated the abutter brought a nuisance complaint and the defendant stated their dock was like every other dock on the lake, it is no bigger than other docks on the lake, the same material, and same configuration; this is not a nuisance. Mr. Tilsley stated the NH Supreme Court ruled that it was a nuisance because of its location. Mr. Tilsley stated the Court stated that a nuisance may merely be a right thing in the wrong place. Mr. Tilsley stated this is exactly what the Board is looking at, the right thing in the wrong place.

Mr. Tilsley stated what he heard from the applicant at the last meeting was we checked all the boxes we meet all the criteria; were the right thing. Mr. Tilsley stated what we are telling you as abutters and neighbors is that it may be the right thing but it is in the wrong place. Mr. Tilsley stated it is too much, it is too big, it is too close. Mr. Tilsley stated under NH case law the right thing in the wrong place is a nuisance, and that gives the Board the ability to adopt or put in place additional restrictions on this development beyond what is in the site plan review regulations.

Mr. Tilsley stated it is appropriate for the Board to recognize the nuisance and impose additional restrictions. Mr. Tilsley stated we submitted mitigating factors that we proposed that would make this project acceptable. Mr. Tilsley stated we have asked to reduce the height, size and number of units to align the building to the scale of surrounding structures. Mr. Tilsley stated our position is a maximum of 35-feet would not constitute a nuisance from a height scale structure perspective. Mr. Tilsley stated anything over that would constitute a nuisance and give the Board the ability to impose additional restrictions.

Mr. Tilsley stated in regard to the restaurant/lounge and parking, the parking is based entirely on the number of hotel rooms; there is not a single parking space based on this restaurant and lounge. Mr. Tilsley stated the neighbors and abutters are against any type of rooftop restaurant and/or lounge from a noise and light perspective. Mr. Tilsley stated if there is going to be a

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

restaurant/lounge in this building then there needs to be parking for it. Mr. Tilsley stated this is something different from a breakfast bar, and he doesn't think the Town has a great ability to enforce a private restriction that the restaurant and lounge are only for hotel guests. Mr. Tilsley stated if they are going to have this type of use then they need to provide parking.

Mr. Tilsley stated that is just an example of why this project is too much, too big and too close. Mr. Tilsley stated we urge the Board to find a nuisance and impose appropriate restrictions as we have outlined.

Mr. Hartmann asked for public comment; Solomon Rosman stated before the North-South Road it was a great area, since then the traffic has increased tremendously. Mr. Rosman stated it is ridiculous the amount of traffic on Intervale Crossroads; they publish it in the paper on how to get around the Village. Mr. Rosman stated it is out of place, it is not the appropriate place at the entrance to a neighborhood; it destroys the quaintness of the Town.

Mr. Rosman stated there has been development on Route 16, and that is the commercial area. Mr. Rosman stated there might have been a four-story hotel there back in the 1800's, but that is gone and the single-story motel has been there without any significant complaint. Mr. Rosman stated a four-story hotel next to a residential neighborhood that already struggles and suffers from the amount of traffic is only asking for more trouble. Mr. Rosman stated it is an unsafe area of Route 16, and there are no sidewalks.

Scott Kudrick, owner of the 1785 Inn, stated he really feels for the people who have given their complaints, they are real issues and they live in the area. Mr. Kudrick stated he has a slightly different viewpoint as a historian. Mr. Kudrick showed a picture of the Intervale Hotel and stated back in the day there were several hotels; there was the Bellevue Inn, the Pendexter Mansion and there was a train that ran four times a day. Mr. Kudrick stated this was the destination in North Conway back in the day; it had that incredible view that attracted a lot of visitors back in the day.

Mr. Kudrick stated he thinks it would be nice to have something back in that area that would attract guests to a wonderful part of our town. Mr. Kudrick stated to be able walk and have a rooftop breakfast, lunch or dinner nearby with family and friends that come to visit sounds like a wonderful thing. Mr. Kudrick stated he understands the complaints with the traffic and that does need to be worked out. Mr. Kudrick stated he thought there was some positives to having some life back in that area if it is done the right way.

Colleen Arons, of Dinsmore Road, submitted an aerial view photo of Intervale NH circa 1920's and an Overlay Present Day Development On and Behind 1920's era Intervale House [in file]. Ms. Arons stated the first aerial view locates the Intervale House and literally shows there is no development behind it, and on page two it shows there is a lot of development that exists now behind the Intervale Hotel. Ms. Arons stated there is the Mountain View Estates, the US Post Office and private residences. Ms. Arons stated there is a significant amount of development that has occurred behind what once was the Intervale House, and this will certainly impact us as neighbors.

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

James Wrigley stated this is not the quietest part of Conway; we live relatively close to the Stonehurst and they do a pretty good job of turning their music off around 7:00 pm, 8:00 pm when they have weddings. Mr. Wrigley stated there is a new place, Starlight Lodge, and they are trying to get into the business to bring in weddings to their little hotel. Mr. Wrigley stated a hotel with 105-rooms is going to be happy to block rooms for people to have weddings in the surrounding area.

Mr. Wrigley stated it makes sense bringing life for Airbnb's with a large lawn outback in which you can put a tent and right across the street can have a room. Mr. Wrigley stated this is why this represents exactly why it's too big, too much. Mr. Wrigley stated we are not just talking about this one property, were talking about the effects of this spilling throughout the whole entire community.

Mr. Wrigley asked where are people going to park when the 115 parking spaces are filled up; they're going to park on Intervale Crossroads and at the Scenic Vista. Mr. Wrigley stated looking at the full ramifications of where this is going, it is not just this is a little too high this is impacting the whole entire community well beyond the immediate vicinity of the building.

Mr. McAllister stated the Board has already received their response to the complaint. Mr. McAllister read the letter addressed to Steven Hartmann dated March 25, 2021 re: Viewpoint North Conway LLC, Proposed Hotel Project, 3599 White Mountain Highway, File #FR21-01 from John J. Ratigan of Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella, PLLC [in file].

Mr. McAllister stated they are not challenging the traffic impact study, but we are not conducting that traffic impact study until they know the context of the design regulations they are going to be working with.

Mr. Porter stated when you look at this in a case-by-case study the examples presented are all on the strip as opposed to being in Intervale. Mr. Porter stated Intervale is zoned Highway Commercial, an oversight when zoning was presented in the 1980's. Mr. Porter stated taking three key sites on the strip and comparing them to the Intervale site is not fair play. Mr. Porter stated when the Board made a decision on those sites the impact was minimum, and the Board made the Red Jacket due some key things to mitigate the impact to the neighborhood.

Mr. Porter stated if this were on the strip, we wouldn't be having this discussion because it would not be impacting a large area that is going to happen with this particular site. Mr. Porter stated the abutter's concerns need to be taken into consideration; traffic is not just impacting that particular locations; it is also impacting the Kearsarge area. Mr. Porter stated he agrees with having a traffic study done as it will also impact the infrastructure of the Mount Washington Valley in the Town of Conway; the roadways in that area are going to see significant impacts.

Mr. Colbath stated it is a nuisance to them whether its legal or standing it is still a nuisance. Mr. Colbath asked regarding #7 on the complaint if there was anything to substantiate that. Mr. Tilsley stated the condominiums with this development right on top of them and losing this view will have an impact on property values. Mr. Tilsley stated we don't have an appraisal and they have not met with a realtor, but it is obvious and not a major point. Mr. Tilsley stated it is a factor to consider,

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

and it is a factor on why they think it is a nuisance; it is not the loss property value that is the nuisance it is the nuisance that causes the loss of property value; it is evidence that a nuisance exists.

Mr. Tilsley stated they have indicated that they meet the zoning and the site plan review regulations. Mr. Tilsley stated §110-39, §110-40 and §110-29.A.6. gives the Board the ability to require some deviation from those regulations when certain criteria such as proving a nuisance are met, that is what we are asking for; we have shown the Board that there is a nuisance and the Board has the right to make certain additional criteria once we show you there is a nuisance. Mr. Tilsley stated a building over 35-feet in this location with these views is a nuisance, and if it is a nuisance the Board can impose additional criteria.

Mr. Colbath stated in architectural design, §110-30.B., it states to conserve property values. Mr. Tilsley stated an appraiser's certificate is not needed if you can see Cranmore Mountain and now you can't see it; that could cause a loss of value.

Ms. Byers asked for clarification of the lounge/restaurant. Mr. McAllister stated the applicants are proposing a lounge/restaurant for use by hotel guests only; it is a hot food service restaurant. Mr. McAllister stated it is an accessory use to the hotel use inside; it is not a public restaurant or a public lounge. Mr. McAllister stated it is going to make food service for people who are staying in the hotel.

Ms. Byers asked the location of the restaurant/lounge. Mr. McAllister stated the first floor has the restaurant and the lounge is on the top middle on the side of the building facing the Scenic Vista. Ms. Byers asked if the roof top lounge area is open. Mr. McAllister stated it is open to the Scenic Vista; portions of it is open air. Mr. McAllister stated they did not include for those uses here because it is not intended to be open to the general public.

Mr. Porter stated however down the road it could be open to the public; Red Jacket was approved strictly for their guests, but now are open to the public. Mr. McAllister stated there is a note on the plan that indicates that the lounge and restaurant are for the users of the hotel only, and any changes to that would require site plan review.

Mr. Hartmann asked if his client would be opposed to a 35-foot height restriction. Mr. McAllister stated he cannot answer that, the design process is also iterative. Mr. McAllister stated a 50-foot buffer has been imposed which reduces the amount of area on site to develop. Mr. McAllister stated with that amount of space is reduced, we now have to maximize the property in different ways; which means we were going to have to find more parking which means the building footprint may have to get smaller because of the increased buffer.

Mr. McAllister stated by requiring the 50-foot buffer we are less likely to be shorter because we have less developmental space. Mr. McAllister stated imposing the 50-foot buffer on the sides will make them keep the height to maximize the development. Mr. Hartmann asked if what if they were required to have a 15-foot buffer and a 35-foot-tall building. Mr. McAllister stated he would have to discuss that with his client.

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

Mr. Ratigen stated we have addressed the criteria that have been raised about their claim to a nuisance and have pointed out, based on the regulations, why those claims are not met. Mr. Ratigen stated we have also asked the Board to rescind the vote on the 50-foot setback and allow Mr. McAllister to present the Board with a plan and address these concerns.

Mr. Ratigen stated we are requesting that the board deny the nuisance complaint, to rescind the 50-foot setback and give Mr. McAllister the ability to redesign and work with the Board. Mr. Ratigen stated that is the fastest way to a good result.

Steven Steiner asked how they were going to address the loss of property values. Mr. Ratigen stated they don't have to as the Board is not granting a variance, but that doesn't mean there cannot be steps once the 50-foot restraint is taken away; with the 50-foot restraint the client is going to need every foot to try to recover the investment.

Mr. Malia stated he was going to suggest to the Board to rescind the 50-foot setback because he thinks it might have been premature; if the Board finds later, after doing that, you agree with the nuisance complaint one of their proposed mitigating restrictions involves the setback. Mr. Malia stated the Board could always reimpose the 50-foot setback after the Board makes a decision on the nuisance complaint and give reasons why you think it is a nuisance. Mr. Malia stated he thinks rescinding the 50-foot setback is a good idea, and that doesn't mean the Board cannot reimpose it later if necessary.

Mr. Malia stated after the Board rescinds the 50-foot setback he was going to suggest making a decision on whether the Board agrees with the nuisance complaint and if the Board agrees with the nuisance complaint, vote on the seven reasons on page 7 on why they think it is a nuisance so the Board can define the nuisance and then go into their proposed mitigating restrictions and vote on each of those.

Mr. Malia stated, however, he thinks he heard a slight opening for a possible resolution from Attorney Ratigen; he suggested that the Board rescind the 50-foot setback and then deny the nuisance complaint and let Mr. McAllister redesign the plan. Mr. Malia stated he suggests rescinding the 50-foot setback, hold off on deciding the nuisance complaint, let Mr. McAllister revise the plan, and then see if it meets the satisfaction of Attorney Tilsley and his clients.

Mr. Ratigen stated that is acceptable; he doesn't think they can satisfy the requirements of a nuisance. Mr. Tilsley stated on behalf of the Grant's if the Board rescinds the 50-foot setback without prejudice so it could be reimposed later if you choose to, we have no problem with them coming back with something different.

Ms. Frechette stated she really appreciates the people of our community coming out to speak on behalf of this; they are not just abutters they are neighbors and part of our livelihood. Ms. Frechette stated she would like to see them work towards a smaller height.

Mr. Irving stated he would like to make a clarification; it is not a setback but a buffer requirement pursuant to §110-29.A.(6).

Adopted: April 8, 2021 – As Written

CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MARCH 25, 2021

Mr. Porter made a motion, seconded by Ms. Byers, to rescind without prejudice the 50-foot buffer requirement imposed pursuant to §110-29.A.(6). Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Porter made a motion, seconded by Ms. Byers, to continue the public hearing for Viewpoint North Conway, LLC until August 26, 2021 with new materials to be submitted by August 3, 2021. Motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Barry Richard Connolly and Jennifer A. Connolly – Lot Merger (PID 298-46 & 47): Ms. Byers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Colbath, to approve the lot merger for Barry and Jennifer Connolly. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:28 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Holly L. Whitelaw
Planning Assistant