

CONWAY PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

MAY 23, 2024

PAGES

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Appointment of Alternate Member |
| 1 | Public Hearing – Proposed Amendments to Site Plan Review Regulations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• §110-4.B. – Minor Site Plan Review – Adopted• §110-29.B. – Greenspace – continued until June 27, 2024 |
| 2 | Work Session <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commercial Development/Hotel and Motel discussion |
| 3 | Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ted C. Hounsell – Lot Merger (PID 277-187 & 188)• HOP Grant Committee Update• Selectmen’s Report• Issues for Consideration• Media Questions |

CONWAY PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

MAY 23, 2024

A meeting of the Conway Planning Board was held on Thursday, May 23, 2024, beginning at 6:01 p.m. at the Conway Town Office, Conway, NH. Those present were: Chair, Benjamin Colbath; Selectmen's Representative, Steven Porter; Vice Chair, Ailie Byers; Secretary, Erik Corbett; Eliza Grant; Ted Phillips; Alternate, Nat Lucy; Town Planner, Ryan O'Connor; and Assistant Planner, Holly Whitelaw.

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATE MEMBER

Chair Colbath appointed Nat Lucy as a voting member for Bill Barbin.

PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS

§110-4.B. – Minor Site Plan Review: The purpose of this amendment is to allow for Minor Site Plan Review of projects which propose no greater than 5 residential units, decrease greenspace of less than 10,000 square feet, increase structural floor area of no more than 35%, lot-line adjustments, and changes-of-use which may require a waiver from Site Plan Regulations.

Mr. O'Connor reviewed the amendment and explained how it would be implemented.

Chair Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none.

Chair Colbath opened the public hearing at 6:03 pm. There was no public comment.

Chair Colbath closed the public hearing at 6:04 pm.

Mr. Porter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Corbett, to adopt the amendments to §110-4.B. – Minor Site Plan Review as written. Motion carried 6-0-1, with Mr. Lucy abstaining.

Chair Colbath and Mr. Porter volunteered to participate on the technical review committee, with Ms. Byers serving as the backup.

§110-29.B. – Greenspace: The purpose of this amendment is to increase the percentage of greenspace from 30% to 40% of the total lot area.

Mr. O'Connor reviewed the amendment. He asked the Board to consider if this would make sense in every zone and if there would be unintended consequences.

Chair Colbath asked for Board comment.

Adopted: June 13, 2024 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MAY 23, 2024

The Board discussed the impact this might have on the Villages, but noted they are pretty much grandfathered. They said the concern was primarily with new development. They agreed they did not want to limit businesses on smaller lots. They agreed they should hold the Village districts to a different standard than the commercial districts on the strip to protect their integrity.

Mr. O'Connor noted the percentage of greenspace could be based on structure size.

In response to a question from Ms. Grant, they discussed why the industrial district had been carved out.

The Board discussed if they want to offer a reduction in greenspace for long-term housing as a bonus and decided not to do this.

Mr. O'Connor will make the changes as discussed and bring the amendment back to the Board for a vote on June 27, 2024.

Ms. Grant made a motion, seconded by Mr. Porter, to continue the public hearing for §110-29.B. – Greenspace until June 27, 2024. Motion carried unanimously.

WORK SESSION

Commercial Development/Hotel and Motel discussion:

Mr. O'Connor explained that funds were awarded to the Town to rewrite the zoning ordinance. This process should begin later this summer.

The Board discussed the protections that should be put into place until this process is complete, which could be by the 2026 Town Meeting. They discussed increasing the vegetative buffer based on the size of a building, which would also address the setback issue, and agreed to implement this.

They discussed how the Village districts should be handled and suggested addressing them as a whole at a later date.

Mr. O'Connor will revise the landscaping section as a whole and send it to the Board for review.

Mr. O'Connor asked if the Board wanted to consider rezoning the central highway commercial area as the commercial core. He noted the Board needs to determine what the future zones are going to be, as they are mixed-use spaces. The Board discussed pulling in zone boundaries.

They discussed what type of businesses would be allowed in the commercial core and the highway commercial district, including hotels. Mr. O'Connor noted they can determine the maximum square footage in the various zones. They discussed a warrant article creating the commercial core and what it would include. They discussed considering both sides of Route 16 differently.

Adopted: June 13, 2024 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MAY 23, 2024

After much discussion, Mr. O'Connor clarified they will limit hotels to a specific area and look at what square footage is appropriate for the northern section of the highway commercial district. He said these will be achievable this year and would provide the necessary protections while the zoning ordinance is being rewritten.

Mr. O'Connor noted there are 11 types of transient occupancy in the Table of Uses. He suggested how this could be simplified.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ted C. Hounsell – Lot Merger (PID 277-187 & 188):

Mr. O'Connor explained this merger will make a non-conforming lot conforming.

Mr. Porter made a motion, seconded by Ms. Grant, to approve the lot merger for Ted C. Hounsell to merge PID 277-187 & 188 into one lot of record. Motion carried unanimously.

HOP Grant Committee Update:

Mr. O'Connor reported the HOP Grant Committee is taking on the mixed-use issue as part of the housing discussion and will help to develop language around this. The next meeting will occur the week of June 11th.

Selectmen's Report:

Mr. Porter said he should have something to report after the next Selectboard meeting.

Issues for Consideration:

Mr. Corbett asked if there will be a Planning Board member on the new Life/Safety Committee. Mr. Porter does not believe this is a Planning purview. He said the committee is being formed in response to the Town and the Fire Department renegotiating the ambulance contract.

Mr. Porter asked if the Board could entertain a form of moratorium to preserve/prohibit future commercial development in the northern commercial corridor. Mr. O'Connor will study what the justification would be for this.

Ms. Grant read a letter in support of the Town's pre-applications for the 2024 Clean Water State Revolving Fund and asked the Board if they would be willing to sign it. The Board discussed the projects that would be funded with these funds and agreed they would sign the letter.

Ms. Byers asked if members can attend meetings remotely. There are State regulations that allow remote participation; however, the member cannot be counted as part of the quorum. The Board discussed this option and decided that members could attend work sessions remotely, but not regular meetings. They also agreed that only one member could attend remotely at a time.

Adopted: June 13, 2024 – As Written
CONWAY PLANNING BOARD – MAY 23, 2024

Chair Colbath made a motion, seconded by Mr. Corbett, to allow one member at a time to remotely attend work sessions, but not regular meetings, no more than four times a year. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Colbath asked if a Planning Board member should be on the Conservation Commission. Mr. Lucy said he did not feel this was necessary; he volunteered as an alternate to the Planning Board to facilitate communication between the two groups.

Media Questions:

Tom Eastman of Conway Daily Sun welcomed Mr. Lucy as an alternate to the Planning Board.

He asked if the 40% greenspace requirement would decrease the number of housing units that could be built at Ridgeline. Mr. O'Connor said the density of the project was previously approved by the Board. They are allowed to make amendments to that plan, as long as they are not vastly different. Ms. Byers said there was already over 40% greenspace in this project.

Mr. Eastman asked, with the new zones, how the Board would control growth in other parts of town, if it is limited on Route 16. He also asked what the Master Plan will do concerning the transfer of growth. The Board explained that one of the goals of the Master Plan is to prevent other areas from being overdeveloped.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth Hanggeli



TOWN OF CONWAY

23 MAIN STREET + P.O. BOX 2680 + CONWAY, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03818

(603) 447-3811
WWW.CONWAYNH.ORG

MEMO

To: Planning Board
From: Planning Staff
Date: May 16, 2024

Re: May 2024, Planning Board Workshop.

Dear Planning Board,

The following outlines what is to be reviewed at the upcoming Planning Board Workshop:

Minor Site Plan Review

The changes to Site Plan Regulations seeks to allow an approval process which is more accessible to small businesses and does not have the cost of a surveyed plan for projects which may have a minimal impact on the site. Minor Site applications would be reviewed by staff and a Planning Board representative at a public hearing. The goal is for applicants to be able to work with all staff that may be reviewing an application (Planning, Building, Engineering) to assist in accomplishing their goals.

The below criteria outlines what types of projects may be reviewed under Minor Site Plan; the full language is within the packet:

- The establishment of a three (3) to five (5) unit multifamily development;
- A reduction of greenspace of greater than 2,000 but less than 10,000 square feet;
- An increase in structural floor area of greater than 1,000 but less than 5,000 square feet or no greater than a 35% increase from current square footage;
- Lot-line adjustments;
- Lot mergers;
- Changes of use which may require a waiver from Site Plan Regulations or a Zoning Board of Appeals decision but are determined to not increase site intensity beyond current capacity.

Increases to Greenspace

The proposed changes to Site Plan Regulations would increase greenspace from 30% to 40% for the development of vacant parcels. For projects on parcels with an existing greenspace of less than 40%, an increase of 2.5% of greenspace would be required for each additional Site Plan application. Proposed language for the Site Plan change is attached.

Commercial Development / Hotels & Motels

Our last discussion of commercial development led to the following as priorities for this year

- Limit large “big box” development
- Scale commercial development (the larger the facility, the larger the setbacks)
- Limit Hotels
- Focus mixed-use development on the village areas

Recently, the Town was notified that we were awarded funds to be able to rewrite our Zoning Ordinance. This will allow the zoning changes of the newly adopted Master Plan to become a reality. Hopefully, these funds will be available midsummer 2024. The SE Group and staff are working toward what a timeframe could look like for making these changes.

Likely the full draft of the revised Zoning Ordinance would be available for the April 2026 Town vote. This leaves the question of what needs to be accomplished this year to protect the Town once the moratorium is no longer in effect. The below recommendations may give us a path to ensure protections are in place until we have the full ordinance completed.

- Attached is a proposed Site Plan change to scale development, much like we’ve been discussing at previous meetings. This would require an increased vegetated buffer area of 1.5 feet for every 1,000 square feet for occupiable floor area. As an example, a 20,000 square foot structure in the Highway Commercial zone would require a 37-foot front buffer and a 22-foot side and rear buffer. A 50,000 square foot building would require a 63-foot front buffer and a 48-foot side and rear buffer.

The goal is to base buffer areas on the size of the proposed structures. This would also work to limit the available area for parking, structures, and other uses, meaning that a large building, such as Wal-Mart, would require over 200 feet of buffer area and only be feasible on parcels with significant acreage.

- The next proposal would be to limit Hotel development to the Eastern side of White Mountain Highway in the Highway Commercial Zone for what is commonly called the “strip”. This would protect our viewshed to the North-West while still allowing an area for this type of development. The change would need to be completed as a Zoning Ordinance amendment.

- Altering the zoning map would also help separate where the Board would like to focus development. “The strip” section of the Highway Commercial District could shift to the “Commercial Core” district as stated in the master plan. This would help distinguish where Hotels and larger developments may be located. This singular shift in the zoning map would then align with the future changes that would be proposed with the fully amended Zoning Ordinance.
- It may also be worthwhile to redefine the types of transient occupancies we have in our Ordinance. Separating Hotels and Motels could allow for small motel development to be permitted or expanded within the commercial areas they currently exist. The Town also has eleven types of transient style housing in our Table of Uses and it may be worthwhile to review, simplify, and address where these different accommodations may be appropriate.

While we may not want to see large scale hotels, these smaller accommodations may allow for a vacation rental facilities which could take the burden off of transient rentals within our neighborhoods.

- The other zoning change that may be worth exploring is limiting the size of commercial development structures within our Table of Uses. Certain zones may not be appropriate for large buildings and the Board can limit that square footage to certain areas. For example, the Commercial Core would allow all sizes of structures, while the Highway Commercial would be limited to 50K, the Village areas to 20K, etc.
- As the Board looks to ensure future proposals are in-line with scale of development you would like to see, it may be worth addressing in Site Plan Regulations how much the topography of the land should change. Excessive amounts of cut or fill on a property can have impacts to drainage, the ecosystem, and quickly alter the natural topography of valley.

These changes are meant to achieve the goals of scaling back large commercial development, while not limiting housing. The proposed amendments are intended to be impactful but also give us time to fully redevelop our regulations to align with the Master Plan. As part of the HOP grant, the SE Group will be looking to address mixed-use type developments and the review of how to welcome more attainable housing.

Proposed Site Plan Changes to Include Minor Site

§ 110-4. Applicability

The following criteria specifies the level of review necessary for a proposal to develop a nonresidential or multifamily site:

- A. **Site Plan Review** not applicable. The determination of "not applicable" by the designee of the Board shall mean that no site plan review approval is necessary, although other types of approvals or permits may be necessary per other municipal codes and an application shall be kept on file. The site plan review regulations shall be deemed not applicable for the following:
1. Temporary events which require no permanent alterations to the site and which function safely within the approved configuration of the site as determined by the designee of the Board.
 2. Special events approved by the Board of Selectmen.
 3. Agricultural buildings as defined in Chapter [190](#), Zoning, of the Conway Code (see § [190-31](#), Definitions).
 4. Small undertakings where it is demonstrated that:
 - a. All proposed changes to the structure and/or site conform to all other applicable codes and reasonably conform to the site design standards of this chapter;
 - b. Proposed changes do not increase the intensity of use on the site beyond the service capacity of existing on-site infrastructure (including but not limited to parking, traffic generation and septic loading);
 - c. Any net reduction in greenspace on the lot is less than or equal to 2,000 square feet;
 - d. Any increase in structure floor space is less than or equal to 1,000 square feet; and
 - e. In order to ensure that cumulative impacts can be evaluated by the Planning Board in a public forum, this Subsection [A\(4\)](#) shall not be applied if its application, combined with prior applications since the latest review by the Planning Board, would result in a cumulative decrease of greenspace greater than 4,000 square feet or in a cumulative increase in structure floor space greater than 2,000 square feet.
 5. Where the Planning Board finds that the change of use and/or physical changes to the site are insignificant relative to the existing development.
- B. **Minor Site Review** required. **Minor Site Review shall be required for proposed commercial and multifamily developments which meets the following criteria:**

Proposed Site Plan Changes to Include Minor Site

1. The establishment of a three (3) to five (5) unit multifamily development, or the redevelopment of a current multifamily development with an increase of no more than five (5) units;
2. A reduction of greenspace greater than 2,000 but less than 10,000 square feet;
3. An increase in commercial structural floor area of greater than 1,000 but less than 5,000 square feet or no greater than a 35% increase in commercial square footage, whichever is less;
4. Lot-line adjustments or Lot mergers;
5. Changes of use which may require a waiver from Site Plan Regulations or a Zoning Board of Adjustment decision but are determined not to increase site intensity beyond current capacity.
6. Minor Site Review applications will be reviewed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) at a public hearing and must address the following:
 - a. Submit a completed application to the Planning Department in accordance with the checklist attached to the application form to include a detailed narrative of all existing and proposed site features.
 - b. A plan indicating the following:
 1. Any public way and significant natural or constructed feature within 250'
 2. A scaled plan which represents existing site details and proposed changes; including but not limited to, structures, setbacks, overlay districts, parking and loading areas, signage, lighting, landscaping, architectural changes, utilities, and amount of area disturbed. Plans are not required to be prepared by a professional engineer or licensed surveyor unless deemed necessary by Town Staff or the TRC.
 3. Wetlands, watercourses and water bodies, significant natural or topographic features, or other significant environmental site aspects may require delineation by a licensed professional If determined necessary by Town Staff or the TRC.
 4. A lot line adjustment shall require plans prepared by a licensed land surveyor.
 - a. A Minor Site Review application must adequately represent the proposal, Adhere to Chapter 190, Zoning Regulations and comply with Chapter 110 Site Plan Review, Article III Design Standards. All applicable Subdivision Regulations shall apply for Lot-Line Adjustment applications. Depending on the scale or impact of the development, Town staff or the TRC may

Proposed Site Plan Changes to Include Minor Site

require additional reviews, more detailed plans, site visits, or other information to ensure the application is in compliance with all applicable regulations. The TRC may determine that Minor Site Review is not acceptable to address all possible concerns and full Site Plan Review is required.

2. **Full Site Plan Review.** Unless a proposal is deemed not applicable pursuant to Subsection A, or qualifies for Minor Site Review under subsection B, a site plan review by the Planning Board shall be required for all commercial development or the creation of multifamily housing. Site Plan Review is also required for the establishment of a commercial use.

Proposed Site Plan Changes to Increase the Landscaped Buffer

§ 110-29. Landscaping.

Every lot shall comply with the following standards in order to: enhance site design; enhance privacy; separate, screen and shield potentially conflicting land uses or abutters from undue impact; reserve a portion of the lot to remain undeveloped, permeable, and vegetated; control excessive stormwater runoff; prevent soil erosion and pollution of water bodies; reduce heat, glare and dust; not detract from the Town's aesthetic qualities; and help integrate the built environment with the natural environment.

- A. Buffer areas. Every lot shall reserve a buffer area along and within its perimeter boundaries in accordance with the following:
- (1) The buffer area shall be defined as that area within the front, sideline, and back lot line setbacks as specified in Chapter 190, Zoning, of the Conway Code, and 100 feet from the platted right-of-way of the North-South Road between the extension of the center line of Barnes Road and the center line of Depot Road, except as limited in Subsection A(5) below, and setbacks from natural resources (such as from rivers or lakes) shall not apply;
 - (2) The buffer area shall be vegetated with a mixture of deciduous and coniferous plantings, except for driveways and other features approved by the Board. The plantings shall be placed to shield structures and uses from the view of abutting properties where the abutting properties would otherwise be adversely impacted. [Amended 5-12-2022]
 - (3) The buffer area shall not be used for merchandise display, vehicle parking or storage, or any other use which conflicts with the purpose and standards of this landscaping section;
 - (4) Driveways shall cross the buffer areas at an angle of $90^{\circ} \pm 15^{\circ}$ to the perimeter boundary;
 - (5) In the Conway Village Commercial and North Conway Village Commercial Districts, the buffer shall not include the area within the front setback. The purpose of this exception is to permit activities related to the primary use within this area, such as outdoor restaurant seating or merchandise display. Such uses shall require Board approval under this chapter, and related site improvements such as additional parking and drainage shall be required; and
 - ~~(6)~~ In order to mitigate nuisance to abutting residential uses and residentially zoned lands, the Planning Board may increase the buffer depth to as much as 50 feet. The Board may also require additional mitigation (including but not limited to vegetation and fencing) or a combination of mitigation strategies to protect abutting residential properties.
 - ~~(6)~~(7) Sites with a proposed gross floor area which exceeds 12,000 Square Feet shall be subject to an additional buffer area of 1 foot from the setback, as defined in Chapter 190, for every additional 1,000 Square Feet of occupiable floor area. This requirement may be waived by the Board for developments restricted for long-term residential use or the redevelopment of existing sites.

Proposed Site Plan Changes to Increase Greenspace

§ 110-29. Landscaping.

Every lot shall comply with the following standards in order to: enhance site design; enhance privacy; separate, screen and shield potentially conflicting land uses or abutters from undue impact; reserve a portion of the lot to remain undeveloped, permeable, and vegetated; control excessive stormwater runoff; prevent soil erosion and pollution of water bodies; reduce heat, glare and dust; not detract from the Town's aesthetic qualities; and help integrate the built environment with the natural environment.

- A. Buffer areas. Every lot shall reserve a buffer area along and within its perimeter boundaries in accordance with the following:
- (1) The buffer area shall be defined as that area within the front, sideline, and back lot line setbacks as specified in Chapter 190, Zoning, of the Conway Code, and 100 feet from the platted right-of-way of the North-South Road between the extension of the center line of Barnes Road and the center line of Depot Road, except as limited in Subsection A(5) below, and setbacks from natural resources (such as from rivers or lakes) shall not apply;
 - (2) The buffer area shall be vegetated with a mixture of deciduous and coniferous plantings, except for driveways and other features approved by the Board. The plantings shall be placed to shield structures and uses from the view of abutting properties where the abutting properties would otherwise be adversely impacted. [Amended 5-12-2022]
 - (3) The buffer area shall not be used for merchandise display, vehicle parking or storage, or any other use which conflicts with the purpose and standards of this landscaping section;
 - (4) Driveways shall cross the buffer areas at an angle of $90^{\circ} \pm 15^{\circ}$ to the perimeter boundary;
 - (5) In the Conway Village Commercial and North Conway Village Commercial Districts, the buffer shall not include the area within the front setback. The purpose of this exception is to permit activities related to the primary use within this area, such as outdoor restaurant seating or merchandise display. Such uses shall require Board approval under this chapter, and related site improvements such as additional parking and drainage shall be required; and
 - (6) In order to mitigate nuisance to abutting residential uses and residentially zoned lands, the Planning Board may increase the buffer depth to as much as 50 feet. The Board may also require additional mitigation (including but not limited to vegetation and fencing) or a combination of mitigation strategies to protect abutting residential properties.
- B. Greenspace. In all zoning districts, greenspace shall comprise no less than ~~30%~~40% of the total lot area, exclusive of wetlands, water bodies, one-hundred-year floodplains (or ten-year floodplains adjacent to Pequawket Pond), and slopes over 25%, except as permitted in Subsection B(1) below. [Amended 4-13-2023]
- (1) In the Industrial-1 District, greenspace shall comprise no less than 25% of the total lot area, inclusive of wetlands, one-hundred-year floodplains (or ten-year floodplains

Proposed Site Plan Changes to Increase Greenspace

adjacent to Pequawket Pond), and exclusive of slopes over 25% and waterbodies.

(2) Impervious surface coverage within the WWPO shall not exceed 25%; including but not limited to buildings, sidewalks, driveways, and parking areas as per 190-28.C.

(+)(3) On existing sites with greenspace less than 40%, an increase in greenspace of 2.5% per Site Plan application is required. Redevelopment proposals should seek to bring existing sites in as close conformance of greenspace requirements as practical. The Planning Board may require additional greenspace as appropriate to limit impervious coverage not to exceed 30%.

- C. Industrial uses in the Industrial-1 District shall plant, at a minimum, trees 50 feet on center in the rear and side setback areas. Trees shall be planted 25 feet on center in all front setback areas. Where buffer areas are adjacent to sites that are landscaped, every effort shall be made to stagger tree plantings such that they fill in the existing voids on the adjacent site. Additionally, every effort shall be made to save existing trees on site. Additional tree plantings may be required by the Board to screen the visual impact of buildings and to aid in noise reduction.
- D. Trees. All lots regulated by this chapter (except those subject to Subsection C) shall have trees in accordance with Subsection D(1) through (11) below.
- (1) Trees, either newly planted or existing on the lot, shall be provided at the rate of one tree per 500 square feet of disturbed area, provided that, in the case of an expansion of an existing site, credit for existing trees shall be granted only for trees which the applicant demonstrates are in excess of the requirements for the existing site under this chapter;
 - (2) To be credited as landscaping, a tree shall have a caliper of at least three inches at a point six inches above the top of the root ball;
 - (3) Credit for landscaping shall only be given to existing trees within 70 feet of the proposed main structure(s) or parking lots;
 - (4) For existing trees which will be preserved, those with a caliper of 12 inches or more may be credited by the Board as two trees, and those with a caliper of 24 inches or more may be credited by the Board as four trees, provided the applicant complies with the relevant provisions of Subsection D(4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) below;
 - (5) To be credited as landscaping, any tree which is planted within 25 feet of a street right-of-way shall not be of a salt-sensitive species, and appropriate documentation shall be presented with the landscaping plan;
 - (6) A minimum of 50% of the total number of required trees for the entire site shall be located in islands and along the borders of the required parking lot(s);
 - (7) Lots which require traffic control islands pursuant to § 110-23 shall locate at least 10% of the total number of required trees for the entire site within the required traffic control islands;
 - (8) Street trees are required to be planted as part of the landscaping required herein. Salt-tolerant trees as defined in the manuals referenced in Subsection D(10) below, of at least three-inch caliper measured at a point six inches above the root ball, shall be planted no more than five feet from the property line along all public and private rights-of-way, at

Proposed Site Plan Changes to Increase Greenspace

a rate of at least one tree per 50 feet of right-of-way. Accordingly, trees should be planted 50 feet on center. Trees shall be planted between the road and the sidewalk where practical. A minimum of two street trees shall be required per lot. The Planning Board shall provide guidance as to the planting location of all proposed street trees; [Amended 4-11-2017 ATM by Art. 29; 4-14-2022]

Tree size and planting locations shall be selected so that the tree, upon reaching its mature size, shall not interfere with existing overhead utility lines, unless, as a part of the application, the overhead lines are to be relocated;

- (9) Planting and transplanting of trees shall be in accordance with accepted horticultural standards, as specified in The Planting and Care of Shade Trees (Maine Forest Service and NH Cooperative Extension Service, Bulletin No. 10, June 1985), or an equivalent technical manual approved by the Board; and
- (10) Existing trees that are to be credited as landscaping shall be protected during site construction activities. A snow fence shall be erected around the tree to protect the roots from soil compression and to help prevent branches from being broken. No storage of any materials or driving of any vehicles within the fenced-in area shall be permitted. The fence shall be no closer to the trunk of the tree than 8.5 feet, and additional distance may be required if the Board deems it necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. In addition, an undisturbed 8.5-foot radius shall be preserved around each existing tree that is to be credited as landscaping, measured from the trunk.

E. General standards. The following general standards shall apply to all lots:

- (1) Landscaping shall not obstruct the line of sight, or create other hazards for vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
- (2) Snow storage shall not be allowed in areas where the trees could be damaged or destroyed; and
- (3) Shrubs, flower beds and other vegetative landscaping shall be permitted at the property owner's discretion. Suitable vegetative ground cover shall be maintained to ensure soil stability.

Holly L. Whitelaw

From: Mark Hounsell <granitestatefocus@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 7:35 AM
To: Holly Whitelaw; Ryan O'Connor; Benjamin Colbath
Subject: 40% Greenspace for this evening's hearing

Please share this testimony with members of the planning board.
Mark Hounsell

110-29.B. – Greenspace – The purpose of this amendment is to increase the percentage of greenspace from 30% to 40% of the total lot area.

Absolutely!

FROM THE MASTER PLAN (page 59)

"The future of Conway's environmental, social, and economic health will be heavily dependent on the stewardship of natural resources and adaptation to a changing climate. This will necessitate thoughtful land use regulation, careful planning for municipal infrastructure, and coordination with local and regional conservation partners."

Observations;

1. Impervious paving is a threat to drinking water.
2. Will result in fewer hotel units being squeezed into cramped sites.
3. Helps maintain natural scenery.

Comment:

The board should consider that in certain instances gravels on roadways and in parking areas should be permitted.

Holly L. Whitelaw

From: William Hounsell <wjhounsell@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 11:26 AM
To: 'hwhitelaw@conwaynh.org'; 'roconnor@conwaynh.org'; 'colbath2@gmail.com'
Subject: Comments for hearing on Zoning ordinance amendment to Greenspace

Green space is how stormwater roof runoff and parking lot runoff is buffered and allowed to filter into the ground without streaming directly into brooks and wetlands and thus the Saco River and the Saco River Aquifer.

It is also important to estimate the impact on road traffic impact on building parking lots and to keep the surface of parking lots pervious and not impervious.

An example: The parking lot directly across from my property on 112 Thompson Road adjacent to where the new recreation trail crosses Thompson Road. was expanded without any notice to me or the owners of 120 Thompson Road. I have lived there since 1980 and know all about how the water flows between the stream near the new Trail and newly expanded parking lot and the brook in back of my house. The trail design engineer called me and asked about what I knew relative to high water conditions for a culvert design for the new trail. I was able to give him 43 years of first hand knowledge on what that storm water did seasonally at high water levels. That is an example of how notifying abutters is important even if the Town and Conservation Commission are working together on a town project. That is why planning should always be done locally and not at the state level.

More information is always better. It is important not to pave that parking lot with impervious asphalt. That acts the same way that preserving greenspace does.

Please share this testimony with members of the planning board.

It requires holistic understanding to plan the results of implementation action. The Planning Board is challenged to link the impact on traffic by everything that is being built. The more impact that more traffic has on Route 16 the more added impact the traffic has on the North South Road by shifting the traffic flow over to the North South Road, and impacts the mini-bypass of traffic through Kearsarge, and Kearsarge Street, and Mechanic Street etc. Linking Greenspace to the narrow stretch of land that is available to build on more densely along the strip is vital to water protection all along that state highway corridor. It takes an understanding about all aspects of what it takes to protect the waters of Conway by preserving greenspace in combination with other methods of thinking and planning and the intertwining connections. I refer to the above dissertation as entanglement of solutions.

I very much support the increase of Greenspace % from 30% to 40%.
Bill Hounsell

110-29.B. – Greenspace – The purpose of this amendment is to increase the percentage of greenspace from 30% to 40% of the total lot area.

FROM THE MASTER PLAN (page 59)

"The future of Conway's environmental, social, and economic health will be heavily dependent on the stewardship of natural resources and adaptation to a changing climate. This will necessitate thoughtful land use regulation, careful planning for municipal infrastructure, and coordination with local and regional conservation partners."