

**TOWN OF RYE – PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING**

**Tuesday, May 11, 2021  
6:00 p.m. – via ZOOM**

***Members Present:* Chair Patricia Losik, Vice-Chair JM Lord, Clerk Steve Carter, Jim Finn, Katy Sherman, Selectmen's Rep Bill Epperson, and Alternates Jeffrey Quinn, Bill MacLeod, Robert Wright and Kathryn Garcia**

***Present on behalf of the Town:* Planning/Zoning Administrator Kimberly Reed**

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Losik called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. via Zoom teleconferencing.

Statement by Patricia Losik:

As chair of the Rye Planning Board, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video and other electronic means. We are utilizing Zoom for this electronic meeting. All members of the board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting by dialing in to the following phone number: 646-558-8656 or by clicking on the following website address: [www.zoom.com](https://www.zoom.com) ID #839 6936 9244 Password: 123456

Public notice has been provided to the public for the necessary information for accessing the meeting, including how to access the meeting using Zoom telephonically. Instructions have also been provided on the website of the Zoning Board of Adjustment at: [town.rye.nh.us](http://town.rye.nh.us) go to the Board of Adjustment page and click on the agenda for this meeting. If anyone has a problem, please call 603-379-0801 or email: Kim Reed at [KReed@town.rye.nh.us](mailto:KReed@town.rye.nh.us).

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled. Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.

Roll call attendance of members:

1. Steve Carter
2. Jim Finn
3. Katy Sherman
4. JM Lord
5. Bill Epperson
6. Jeffrey Quinn
7. Bill MacLeod
8. Rob Wright
9. Patricia Losik

Unless otherwise noted above, members confirmed they were alone in the room for the meeting.

Note: Patricia Losik seated Alternate Bill MacLeod for Nicole Paul.  
Alternate Kathryn Garcia joined after roll call.

**II. Approval of April 13, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

- *Moved to end of meeting.*

**III. To Review Applications to determine if they are complete:**

- a. **Major 4 lot subdivision** by Jones & Beach, Engineers, Inc. for Michael Fecteau for property located at 850 Washington Road, Tax Map 11, Lot 130 to subdivide the existing lot into four residential lots with a road. Property is in the Single Residence District and Aquifer & Wellhead District. **Case #01-2021.**

- *Continuance requested by the applicant.*

Referring to the file, Chair Losik noted items for the application that are still outstanding:

- 1) Hydrological study is not complete, as indicated by applicant.
- 2) New set of plans with layout. The Board cannot determine where, and if, additional test pits are needed. Plan sheets should be provided.
- 3) Documentation for Lot 3 to determine lot depth.
- 4) Documentation on determining lot depth for Lot 1.
- 5) Documentation on determining lot depth for Lot 2.
- 6) Additional test pits.

**Motion by JM Lord to continue the application for 850 Washington Road to the June 8, 2021 meeting with the outstanding items, as listed by Chair Losik, being noted.**

**Seconded by Bill Epperson.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**

**Motion passed.**

- b. Minor Non-Residential Site Development** application by Rye Place Realty, LLC for property 150 Lafayette Road, Tax Map 10, Lot 14 to convert gravel unstriped parking area to paved parking area with striping per Section 202-2.1. B(1)(b) and Section 202-2.1.B(2)(c). Property is in the Commercial District, Aquifer Protection District. **Case #06-2021.**

- *The Planning Board determined the application was complete at their meeting on April 13, 2021.*

- c. Major Site Development Plan** by the Wentworth by the Sea Country Club for property owned by WBTSCC Limited Partnership and located at 60 Wentworth Road, Tax Map 24, Lot 61-26 to construct a new covered porch addition to the existing clubhouse building to provide outdoor seating. The proposed porch will replace the awning footprint that received conditional approval by the Planning Board (Case #11-2020) Property in the Single Residence District. **Case #07-2021.**

*Alternate Rob Wright recused himself from discussion on this application. It was also noted that Planning Administrator Kimberly Reed is a member of WBTSCC; however, she is not a voting board member.*

**Motion by JM Lord to determine the application by Wentworth by the Sea Country Club for property located at 60 Wentworth Road as complete and move it to a public hearing. Seconded by Bill MacLeod.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**  
**Motion passed.**

#### **IV. Public Hearings on Applications:**

- A. Major 4 lot subdivision** by Jones & Beach, Engineers, Inc. for Michael Fecteau for property located at 850 Washington Road, Tax Map 11, Lot 130 to subdivide the existing lot into four residential lots with a road. Property is in the Single Residence District and Aquifer & Wellhead District. **Case #01-2021.**

**Motion by Bill Epperson to continue the public hearing on the application for 850 Washington Road to June 8, 2021. Seconded by Steve Carter.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**  
**Motion passed.**

- B. Minor Non-Residential Site Development** application by Rye Place Realty, LLC for property 150 Lafayette Road, Tax Map 10, Lot 14 to convert gravel unstriped parking area to paved parking area with striping per Section 202-2.1. B(1)(b) and Section 202-2.1.B(2)(c). Property is in the Commercial District, Aquifer Protection District. **Case #06-2021.**

Chair Losik noted that the Board had a site walk. Also, a host of information has been received since the site walk; correspondence from Attorney Donovan, correspondence from Danna Truslow, and correspondence from Steve Harding at Sebago Technics.

**John Chagnon, Ambit Engineering**, presented to the Board on behalf of the applicant. (He presented the letter from Ambit Engineering in response to comments and questions from the Town regarding the application.) Mr. Chagnon noted that the first memorandum was received from Attorney Donovan on May 5<sup>th</sup>. Attorney Donovan made comments about four particular areas; access drive, parking, septic system variances and stormwater management.

In regards to access drive, Mr. Chagnon stated it is the existing drive that comes around the rear of the site from Airfield Drive. The location of that encroaches onto the abutting property. The plans showed that the gravel driveway would be paved. Attorney Donovan submitted his opinion that the Planning Board cannot approve a plan that shows work on the abutter's property. Mr. Chagnon continued that he has submitted a "Driveway Access Exhibit" which shows the relocation of the drive to a position entirely within the easement area. However, he would like the opportunity to continue discussions with the abutting property owner regarding an easement to leave it in place. He would request the Board grant an approval on the attached plan with the stipulation that if an easement is obtained, the driveway does not have to be moved. (The plan entitled "Driveway Option Exhibit" was presented on the screen for the Board's review.) Mr. Chagnon noted that the existing gravel line is show on the plan in green. The proposal is to move the driveway to the area that is shown in grey. It would require the reconfiguration of the retaining wall, but it would move the driveway off the abutter's property.

Referring to the existing access drive (green area on plan), Selectmen's Rep Epperson commented there is no curbing or defined boundary in that area. He asked if the driveway was just created over the course of the years by inattention.

Mr. Chagnon pointed out the actual property line on the plan. He explained that at a certain point in time, an easement was granted to the predecessors, of the current owners, a driveway easement 20' wide. He is not sure if the easement was even in the correct place when it was granted. It was on a plan that was done in 1989 for moving some lot lines around. That plan showed the driveway in the location that it is now, which went through the planning board process and was approved. He continued that the driveway has been there for more than 20 years, but the easement isn't that old. He thinks some assumptions were made along the way in regards to the granted easement.

Selectmen's Rep Epperson replied that would be his guess too. It looks like there is no delineation for that easement out there at all. It's natural that people would not have any gumption about driving over the easement onto the other property. He thinks it's a good thing it is being made very clear.

Mr. Chagnon stated it looks like the retaining wall has been there for a while. He doesn't think this is a creep over time thing. He thinks it is inattention to creating the easement and not knowing where the lines were.

Planning Administrator Kim Reed commented that she used to babysit at the house that is right next to the access road back in the early 80's and that road was there back then.

Chair Losik stated there was a note on Attorney Donovan's letter in regards to the existing easement. She thinks there was even a note that it was a Rye Water District easement initially. She asked if a copy of the existing easement has been sent to Attorney Donovan.

Mr. Chagnon replied that he is not sure he did. The easement is listed on the boundary survey plan.

Chair Losik commented that Attorney Donovan mentioned that if a copy of the easement had not been submitted, to do so. In regards to the continuing discussion with the abutting property owner, Chair Losik asked if that would be to derive some kind of easement, change in ownership or some provision to enjoy rights.

Mr. Chagnon confirmed. He explained that they are asking for the Board to approve this relocation as part of the approval of the parking area. However, if they are able to secure rights to keep the driveway in the same location, it would not have to be moved. Mr. Chagnon continued that the next comment from Attorney Donovan was in regards to the parking situation. Attorney Donovan expressed an opinion that the parking deficit does not require zoning relief. Through the history of this property, various approvals have been granted for changes in use at the property over time. It is hard to pinpoint exactly when. Based on where it is today, they have given a table so there is a definite point in time moving forward.

Chair Losik stated that one of the things that Attorney Donovan mentioned was the possibility of a condition of approval regarding future permitting of renovations involving changes of use not be approved without a review of parking requirements. In the information that was sent, it was said that this site undergoes changes due to its nature and changes will occur in the future. She asked if this is something they would be amenable to.

Mr. Chagnon replied that he thinks this is stepping into the building inspector's role. It is appropriate to say to the building inspector that he should be cognizant of changes in use causing requirements in parking to be shifted. However, he is not going to argue with Attorney Donovan's proposed condition of approval. He pointed out that he doesn't think that actually made it to the list of proposed conditions of approval.

In regards to Attorney Donovan's comments on the septic system variance, Mr. Chagnon stated that the opinion expressed was that the matter should be left to the Rye ZBA. Stormwater management facilities was the next comment. Attorney Donovan expressed an opinion that the review of the drainage system should rest with Sebago Technics and Truslow Resource Consulting. Attorney Donovan submitted some proposed conditions that can be discussed. The reviews from Sebago and Danna Truslow have been completed.

Alternate Quinn asked the status of the septic system variance.

Planning Administrator Reed noted that the application will be before the ZBA at the June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

Mr. Chagnon continued that the next letter was the site plan review letter by Sebago Technics. The first comments were in regards to the site plan. A couple of comments were made in which the applicant agrees. (He read the comments from the letter #1 and #2.) In regards to Sebago's comment #3, Mr. Chagnon noted that it says "there are several pavement edge radii that have not been dimensioned". All the radii have been dimensioned on a revised Sheet C3. Mr. Chagnon read Sebago's comments in regards to their recommendation for a waiver request to Section 202-6.3 E(1)(b) to allow for the parking spaces to be 18' long. He noted that the applicant is hereby requesting the waiver to allow for the depth of those spaces.

Chair Losik asked if there is also a request a waiver to change the aisle width of 26' to 24'.

Mr. Chagnon replied no. He explained that because they have the extra width, they will be keeping the 26' width and asking for the .5" reduction in the length of the parking spot. He continued by reading comment #4 from Sebago's review stating that the sedimentation barriers and temporary stone construction entrance shown on Drawing D1 should also be shown on Drawing C4. The locations will be added to Sheet C4. The applicant is proposing one on each end of the site. Mr. Chagnon read comment #5 regarding Drawing D1, which depicts a 1.5-inch binder course of 19mm pavement mix. Sebago recommended that the designer consider using a 12.5mm pavement mix at the 1.5-inch depth binder course or increasing the depth to 2.25-inches. Mr. Chagnon noted that this detail has been revised to show a 2-inch lift, which conforms to Pavement Mix Type Guidelines.

Mr. Chagnon read the stormwater (HydroCAD) comments from Sebago's review, along with his responses. There was some discussion in regards to comment #3 from Sebago about whether this would be considered a redevelopment project under Section 202-9.5.A(1) of the Land Development Regulations. It was agreed that more information on Sebago's comments would be needed from Steve Harding.

In regards to Sebago's comment regarding the FocalPoint drainage system, Mr. Chagnon noted that Steve Harding indicated that he wasn't a fan of that treatment system. He talked with Mr. Harding about replacing that system with a rain garden. (A revised plan showing rain garden treatment areas was presented to the Board.) Mr. Chagnon explained the difference is that the FocalPoint system is a lot smaller in size. To provide the alternative treatment, the area is bigger, as the FocalPoint system is about half the size. He agrees with Mr. Harding and a design has been done to go that way. There are just other implications to the site that need to be discussed; one of them being the expanded horizontal area. (He pointed out on the plan the area that is meant for additional treatment.) He explained that a curb is proposed in this area to bring the impervious surface runoff to a second rain garden that would provide additional treatment, which was suggested in Mr. Harding's letter. (Mr. Chagnon reviewed the details of the rain garden. There was also some discussion about the need for a special exception from the ZBA for the impact to the buffer.)

Mr. Chagnon continued to review the comments and responses with regard to Sebago's letter. In regards to Sebago's comment about providing the reduced impervious surface area on the submissions, he pointed out that the Impervious Surface Area calculations are in a table on Sheet C5. In regards to Sebago's comment about using 6 minutes of concentration value for stormwater modeling, Mr. Chagnon stated that the analysis was redone using 6 minute time of concentrations and the results of the study are not altered. Mr. Chagnon finished reviewing Sebago's comments. He then reviewed comments from Truslow Resource Consulting, Danna Truslow, and his responses to those comments.

Mr. Chagnon noted additional submittals in support of the application:

- Pavement Mix Type Guidelines
- Parking stall length waiver request -202-6.3.E (1)(b) – 10x18 w/26' wide aisle
- Driveway Option Exhibit
- Rain Garden Details A and B
- Revised Site Plans C3, C4, C6 and D1
- Revised Sheet C6, Tree Location Plan, to show the current proposed tree line

After the presentation, Chair Losik opened to the Board for questions.

Member Quinn stated it is difficult to see how much of the rain gardens are in the wetland buffer and whether that needs to be addressed with a zoning board waiver.

Mr. Chagnon replied that he does not have the numbers for the increased buffer impact. If there is some consensus from the board, he could get the numbers and submit them on a special exception application to the Zoning Board. He reminded the Board that the previous plan impacted a lot of that area. Referring to the plan on the screen, Mr. Chagnon pointed out the area where they were showing a sedimentation basin to help improve the situation with the runoff from the upper part of the site, which runs through a culvert under the building. He then presented the plan showing what the additional impact of adding the second rain garden would be.

Chair Losik stated she goes back to Steve Harding's letter of May 7<sup>th</sup> on page 3 it says; "We believe that the designer's intention to shift treatment devices from a FocalPoint device to a rain garden would be an improvement to the stormwater management plan". She continued that in Danna Truslow's letter, it seems to be a preferred option. Just after the site walk, there was some concern expressed from Mr. Chagnon about the FocalPoint system.

Mr. Chagnon confirmed. He stated that it's new. Its application may be more important in very urbanized areas where there's really no room to do anything. The nature of that soil is a proprietary mix that has a certain price associated with it that might be astronomical for this site as compared to what is affordable for this site and will work. The FocalPoint is going to require more maintenance and review. The size of it is so small it allows for water to pass through it more rapidly with the same treatment. He pointed out that Mr. Harding is not convinced that is the best thing and would prefer the rain garden, which will be larger.

Chair Losik asked Alternate MacLeod if he has any thoughts about the stormwater treatment mechanism.

Alternate MacLeod commented that he agrees with Mr. Harding. Rain gardens have been out for awhile and all the “bugs” have been worked out. He thinks that would be a less complex system and would probably provide greater environmental protection than some proprietary system where there is not a lot of experience. He agrees the rain garden would be better.

Vice-Chair Lord stated he agrees. There is a little more impact in the buffer area. However, the benefits certainly outweigh the impacts at this stage. The direction they are heading is a good direction.

Member Finn stated he agrees, as well.

Chair Losik noted that she counted about 22 trees that were larger than the 4.5 inches. However, it was said there may be a way around that with a little bit of movement in the assets.

Member Carter asked if it is difficult to keep grass in the rain gardens. It seems like the water would pass through very quickly and be stored underneath.

Mr. Chagnon explained there are certain mixes that work well in the rain gardens. The grass might be taken out entirely. Some of the better functioning rain garden designs just have a gravel mix with the vertical treatment through the soil. It is probably better to provide a design that doesn't need to have vegetation.

Chair Losik stated that when she read Ms. Truslow's comments, it seemed that she was really talking about native shrubs or herbaceous plants at the end of the swale; between the swale and the wetland boundary. That seemed to be more of her concern.

Mr. Chagnon stated that what she is talking about is more of the edge of the site. For instance, on the side slope of the septic system. Plantings could be added in that area so whatever does run off on that side of the septic field would have more plants. Because the wetlands are further away, he thinks Ms. Truslow was talking about the edges that are closer to the wetlands (eastern edges).

Chair Losik commented that this is the picnic and play area. She thinks that additional plantings on the east side would be beneficial.

Alternate MacLeod asked if the plan is to change the site plan to show the driveway in the easement, but go back to the original design if there is a chance to work with the abutter.

Mr. Chagnon explained they would change the plan to show the driveway being constructed within the easement. There could be a note on the plan, or in the approval, that if an easement can be obtained from the abutter, the driveway can be improved in its present location.

Alternate MacLeod commented this is a reasonable solution.

Alternate Wright asked if the driveway change has any impact on the hydrology.

Mr. Chagnon replied no. It is the same width, so it is the same impervious surface either way.



Speaking to Alternate MacLeod, Chair Losik commented that there was mention of site work outside of that easement; such as, grading.

Alternate MacLeod explained that the plan showed proposed contour lines outside of the edge of the pavement area. The Board would have to see a more detailed plan of constructing the driveway in the easement area to be sure no work took place outside. As Attorney Donovan said, the Board can't approve a plan that shows work on another person's property.

Chair Losik asked if he is thinking the grading piece gets bigger.

Alternate MacLeod stated that if they obtain an easement from the abutter to have the driveway stay in its existing location, as well as a temporary easement to do the grading, he would not have an issue.

Referring to the plan on the screen showing the easement area, Mr. Chagnon pointed out that the green shading is on the abutter's property. If they are going to go on the abutting property to remove the pavement, they would be on the abutter's property. He noted that they have a letter from the abutter saying that he would be happy with it staying in that location. (He read the letter to the Board from the abutter.) He thinks a letter from the abutter saying that the work can be done on his property would be sufficient.

Alternate MacLeod commented that Attorney Donovan wasn't comfortable with a license because it is revocable.

Mr. Chagnon agreed. However, in the short-term, if work is needed to be done on the property, a letter (license) should be sufficient.

Alternate MacLeod reiterated that the Board needs to have a plan that shows the detail of the construction within the easement.

Vice-Chair Lord suggested having plan sheets showing both options. The alternate option, outside of the easement area, would be conditioned upon the easement. He commented that they could design both options and have them ready to go.

Alternate MacLeod agreed.

Selectmen's Rep Epperson also agreed.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chair Losik opened to the public at 7:31 p.m.

Speaking to Mr. Chagnon, Selectmen's Rep Epperson stated that he does not see any "deal breakers" with this application. However, he thinks it is really important to impress upon the ZBA the history of this property. The history of this property goes back to the 1950's. What is being done now is a significant improvement and the ZBA should know that.

Chair Losik closed to the public at 7:32 p.m.

Chair Losik pointed out there is a requirement to have a plant maintenance plan, which is in the LDR's. She was trying to comprehend how the detailed planting plans could be fashioned, along with Ms. Truslow's suggestions for additional plantings, into a maintenance plan to address that requirement (202-11.5). The plan just needs to outline who will be maintaining the plants and what happens if they die and need to be replaced.

Chair Losik continued that when they were on the site walk, it was mentioned that there are a few septic tanks that are staying in the place. She asked Mr. Chagnon to show where those are located.

Mr. Chagnon pointed out the location on the plan for the Board. He explained that the tanks that are going to remain are on the mall side. There are tanks on the motel that are going to be replaced.

Speaking to Mr. Chagnon, Chair Losik commented that a lot of this information is being seen firsthand this evening. She appreciates the thoroughness in addressing all the concerns that were brought forth by the Board's experts. It sounds like there are going to be some more design changes. When those are ready, the Board will want a new set to view both options for the driveway and the design for the rain garden. She asked when the proposal will be going to the Rye Conservation Commission.

Mr. Chagnon replied that the application will be before the Conservation Commission on May 13<sup>th</sup>. He does not anticipate there will be a need for a site walk because a number of RCC members attended the Planning Board's site walk. The intent is to have the RCC discuss the plan and make recommendations for the Zoning Board.

No further comments or questions were heard from the Board.

**Motion by JM Lord to continue the application for 150 Lafayette Road to the June 8, 2021 meeting. Seconded by Bill MacLeod.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter - Yes; Jim Finn - Yes; Bill MacLeod - Yes; Katy Sherman - Yes; Bill Epperson - Yes; JM Lord - Yes; Patricia Losik - Yes**

**Motion passed.**

- C. Major Site Development Plan** by the Wentworth by the Sea Country Club for property owned by WBTSCC Limited Partnership and located at 60 Wentworth Road, Tax Map 24, Lot 61-26 to construct a new covered porch addition to the existing clubhouse building to provide outdoor seating. The proposed porch will replace the awning footprint that received conditional approval by the Planning Board (Case #11-2020) Property in the Single Residence District. **Case #07-2021.**

**Corey Colwell, TF Moran**, spoke to the Board. He introduced WBTSCC General Manager Bob Diodati, WBTSCC Superintendent Jason Bastille, Scott Cornett of Northpoint Construction, and Engineer Justin Macek. He continued that in December 2020, the Board granted a major site

development approval for an addition to the existing outdoor patio; which included, a pedestrian sidewalk, relocation of the practice putting green, landscaping and an aluminum awning cover over a portion of the patio. (He presented the previously approve plan on the screen.)

Mr. Colwell continued that the relocation of the putting green and the patio expansion is nearly complete. However, the awning construction has not yet begun, nor is it intended to begin. It has since been learned that the awing in this location is not practical, due to prevalent winds coming off Little Harbor. Contractors have advised that in this setting, something more permanent is required that would hold up longer and not pose a potential threat to the diners. For these reasons, the project proposes to replace the previously approved awning with a covered porch. The proposed porch is being done in an effort to separate the guests due to Covid protocols. By separating the tables outside, guests can be accommodated and feel safer while dining at the club. The porch and the patio have the capacity for 80 seats combined. The hours of operation will remain the same. There is no need for additional parking because the dining capacity has not increased. Guests are nearly shifting from the inside to the outside, either on the porch or the patio.

Mr. Colwell continued that the patio does not propose an increase in impervious coverage, as it will be going over the existing patio. Therefore, no additional stormwater is generated as a result of this proposal. Existing drainage patterns will remain unaltered. Drainage will be directed to the existing yard drains and eventually into the existing drainage pond to the west. (Mr. Colwell reviewed the drawings that were submitted with the site plan.)

Mr. Colwell stated that he feels the application is relatively minor. However, the project qualifies as a Major Site Development, as it is construction of a structure more than 12' in height. The height of the high point of the roof is 17.1'. He pointed out that submitted with the application are two waiver requests. First, a waiver is being requested to Article 3, Section 202-3.5.B(1)(a), which requires a final stormwater management plan. The reason for the request is that the construction covers 0.041% of this property. It does not propose any increase in impervious coverage. It does not propose any change to existing stormwater runoff, nor does it generate any additional stormwater runoff. All existing drainage patterns remain unaltered. Requiring a final stormwater management plan for a proposal that does not alter existing drainage or increase stormwater runoff isn't warranted. Secondly, a waiver has been requested to Article 3, Section 202-3.5.A(6)(i) for an onsite disposal plan. The proposed porch does not increase the number of guests or patrons utilizing the dining room. It just allows people to dine outside. There is no increase in the flows to the existing septic system. Therefore, no changes to the system are required. For those reasons, it is felt that a waiver for the onsite disposal plan is warranted.

Chair Losik stated that she would like to take this opportunity to establish an escrow of \$750 for Sebago review.

The applicant agreed.

Alternate MacLeod stated that as he recalls, the Board waived the requirement for a stormwater study when they approved the awning.

Chair Losik confirmed.

Alternate MacLeod commented there is really no difference between the awning and the permanent roof of the porch. He does not have any objection to that waiver. He also commented that the porch looks far better than any awning. This is only an improvement over a previously good plan to start with.

Member Sherman asked if there will be 80 extra seats when the Covid restrictions are lifted. She asked if this would change the requirements for the disposal system.

**Bob Diodati, WBTSCC General Manager**, explained they are restricted to the number of members. There is a waitlist for membership at the club, which is capped by the club's charter. Even after the Covid restrictions are released, the club still has a limited number of patrons.

Mr. Colwell noted that there is also a maximum capacity for the dining room, which is established by the fire department and building code. That capacity cannot be exceeded and it includes the outside dining.

Member Carter asked how much bigger the porch will be versus the awning.

Mr. Colwell stated that the porch is about the same length as the awning and is approximately the same width, as well. The size is really close to the awning. The only difference is the bump-out on the south side of the porch.

Member Carter asked if any changes were made to the pedestrian access to the tent.

Mr. Diodati replied that they have not built the pedestrian walkway. It is still on the previous approval plan that included the awning. In order to get this open for the season, the pedestrian walkway was not built at this time. The intent is to open the patio for outdoor dining. In the fall, subject to approval, the porch will be built with the previously approved walkway.

Mr. Colwell commented the walkway has not been changed.

Chair Losik opened to the public for comments. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing at 8:10 p.m.

**Motion by JM Lord to approve a waiver from Section 202-3.5.B (1)(a) of the Rye Land Development Regulations to require a stormwater management plan for the entire property, as strict conformity would impose an unnecessary hardship and the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations because the proposed development is part of a 110-acre lot and the applicant is only approving approximately 1,965sf or 0.041% of the property. Seconded by Bill Epperson.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**  
**Motion passed.**

**Motion by JM Lord to approve a waiver from Section 202-3.5.A(6)(i) of the Rye Land Development Regulations which requires a list of all federal and state permits required for the project, as strict conformity would impose an unnecessary hardship and the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations because the proposed porch does not propose any connection to the existing septic system and therefore, does not impact peak flows to the disposal system; and the design does not propose any changes to the existing septic tanks, leachfields or other components of the septic system. Seconded by Bill Epperson.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**

**Motion passed.**

**Motion by JM Lord to approve the Major Site Development Plan by Wentworth by the Sea Country Club for property owned by WBTSCC Limited Partnership and located at 60 Wentworth Road, Tax Map 24, Lot 61-26 to construct a new covered porch addition to the existing clubhouse to provide outdoor seating. The proposed porch will replace the awning footprint that received conditional approval by the Planning Board in Case #11-2020. The Property is in the Single Residence District; Case #07-2021. The approval includes a waiver to Section 202-3.5.B(1)(a) for a final stormwater management plan and a waiver to Section 202-3.5.A(6)(i) for the site disposal plans and also to incorporate on Sheet C10, of the prior plan, a sidewalk on the north side between the existing painted crosswalk and new pavers.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**

**Motion passed.**

## **V. Committees**

Planning Administrator Reed reported that the Planning Board was not awarded the PREPA Grant. It was a very good application and they thought that doing a visioning session was a good idea. However, there were other towns that were meeting the strict criteria of the PREPA Grant. She continued that the Long Range Planning Committee is working within the bounds of the \$8,000 budget to work with Julie LaBranche to hold a visioning session and complete a visioning chapter.

Member Carter stated that the committee met on May 5<sup>th</sup> with Julie LaBranche and the extended committee. They worked on some ideas for the questionnaires. Ms. LaBranche has taken those questions and will be providing a draft of the survey that will go to the town committees. She will then be working on the one that will be going to the general public. The intent is to get the town committee questionnaire out by early to mid-June. The public questionnaire will go out in mid-July for the surveys to return by the end of August. The visioning session is intended to take place at the end of September.

## **VI. Correspondence**

- Chair Losik noted that Planning Administrator Reed has been receiving updates from Eversource, so it seems like the communication is working. When there are

private property owners who have completed their approval process Planning Administrator Reed hears about it.

- Soil test results have been received from Webster at Rye. Those were provided by Robbi Woodburn. The results have been also provided to Danna Truslow.
- RCC and DPW hosted a collaborated effort with Julia Peterson of U.N.H., which was a presentation regarding fertilizers, soils, clean water and best management practices.

## **VII. Other Business**

- Vice-Chair Lord noted that the developer of 421 South Road is trying to get that ready to clean up, so final escrows can be released. Most of the work has been completed on Autumn Lane. Lots 1 and 5 are the only lots that do not have a house on them. Everything else is under construction.
- Chair Losik noted that reports have been received from Steve Harding regarding 1244 Washington Road and it seems to be going well. The last report was filled with detail about the bio-retention pond and drainage. The team seems to be doing a good job.

## **VIII. Escrows**

**Motion by JM Lord to approve the following escrows:**

- 1) 711 Long John Road – Danna Truslow for \$516.25 and Attorney Donovan for \$603.31;
- 2) 850 Washington Road – Danna Truslow for \$385.00 and Sebago Technics for \$1,420.95;
- 3) Stoneleigh – Sebago Technics for \$1,211.75 and \$632.50; and
- 4) 1244 Washington Road – Sebago Technics for \$574.60.

**Seconded by Bill Epperson.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**

**Motion passed.**

### **➤ Approval of Minutes – April 13<sup>th</sup>**

The following corrections were noted:

- Page 3, in the notice, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence should read: **Lot 14 to convert**
- Page 15, in the notice, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence should read: **to convert gravel unstriped parking area to paved parking are with striping**
- Page 11, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence should read: **He noted that this trimming does not have anything to do with system upgrades.**

- Page 11, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 7<sup>th</sup> sentence should read: **In most cases, all that is being trimmed back are the resprouts, which is the vegetation that has grown in over time since the last trim cycle.**
- Page 16, middle paragraph, 6<sup>th</sup> sentence from bottom should read: **There will be no revisions to utility services, except for underground power feeds to the relocated parking lights and septic pump stations.**
- Page 18, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph from bottom, last sentence should read: **The Board might just reach out to Ms. Truslow who might reduce the amount of liming and fertilizing, which may be beneficial to the owner.**
- Page 22, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, last sentence should read: **The intent is to distribute those units equally about the project in separate buildings.**

**Motion by JM Lord to approve the minutes of April 13, 2021 as amended.**

**Seconded by Jim Finn.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**

**Motion passed.**

### **Adjournment**

**Motion by JM Lord to adjourn at 8:25 p.m. Seconded by Bill MacLeod.**

**Roll Call: Steve Carter – Yes; Jim Finn – Yes; Bill MacLeod – Yes; Katy Sherman – Yes; Bill Epperson – Yes; JM Lord – Yes; Patricia Losik – Yes**

**Motion passed.**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dyana F. Ledger

# RYE PLANNING BOARD

10 Central Road Rye, NH 03870 (603) 964-9800

## Notice of Decision

**Applicant:** Rye Place Realty, LLC

**Case:** Case #06-2021

**Application:** Minor Non-Residential Site Development application by Rye Place Realty, LLC for property 150 Lafayette Road, Tax Map 10, Lot 14 to convert gravel unstriped parking area to paved parking area with striping per Section 202-2.1.B(1)(b) and Section 202-2.1.B(2)(c). Property is in the Commercial District, Aquifer Protection District. Case #06-2021.

**Date of Decision:** Tuesday April 13, 2021 *May 11, 2021*

**Decision:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Continued
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Approved.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Denied

*The Planning Board 7-0-0 to continue the application to the June 8, 2021 meeting.*

5/13/21  
**Date**



**Patricia Losik, Chairman**  
**Rye Planning Board**



# RYE PLANNING BOARD

*10 Central Road Rye, NH 03870 (603) 964-9800*

## Notice of Decision

**Applicant/Owner:** Wentworth By the Sea Country Club,  
WBTSCC Limited Partnership

**Property:** 60 Wentworth Road, Tax Map 24, Lot 61-26  
Property is in the Single Residence District.

**Case:** Case #07-2021

**Application:** Major Site Development Plan by the Wentworth by the Sea Country Club for property owned by WBTSCC Limited Partnership and located at 60 Wentworth Road, Tax Map 24, Lot 61-26 to construct a new covered porch addition to the existing clubhouse building to provide outdoor seating. The proposed porch will replace the awning footprint that received conditional approval by the Planning Board (Case #11-2020) Property in the Single Residence District. Case #07-2021.

**Date of Decision:** Tuesday May 11, 2021

**Decision:** **The Planning Board unanimously voted to accept Jurisdiction of the application and approval of the following waivers:**

1. Section 202-3.1.B.1(a) the final stormwater and management plan;
2. Section 202-3.5.A.6(i) on site disposal plans.

**The Planning Board unanimously voted to approve the Major Site Development Plan by the Wentworth by the Sea Country Club for property owned by WBTSCC Limited Partnership and located at 60 Wentworth Road, Tax Map 24, Lot 61-26 for an addition to the existing outdoor patio, pedestrian sidewalk, an awning cover over a portion of the patio, and relocation of existing practice/putting green, landscaping and a paver apron with the following condition:**

1. On sheet C-10 a sidewalk is indicated on the northside between the existing painted crosswalk and the new pavers.

5/13/21  
**Date**



**Patricia Losik, Chairman, Rye Planning Board**

# RYE PLANNING BOARD

*10 Central Road Rye, NH 03870 (603) 964-9800*

## Notice of Decision

**Applicant/Owner:** Michael Fecteau and Mike Gerrapy

**Property:** 850 Washington Road, Tax Map 11, Lot 130  
Property is in the Single Residence District and Aquifer and Wellhead District

**Case:** Case #01-2021

**Application:** Major 4 lot subdivision by Jones & Beach, Engineers, Inc. for Michael Fecteau for property located at 850 Washington Road, Tax Map 11, Lot 130 to subdivide the existing lot into four residential lots with a road. Property is in the Single Residence District and Aquifer & Wellhead District. Case #01-2021.

**Date of Decision:** Tuesday May 11, 2021

**Decision:**        Approved  
  x   Continued

**The Board voted 7-0-0 that the application was incomplete for the following reasons and to continue the application to the June 8, 2021 meeting:**

1. The applicant needs to provide the Board with a Hydrogeologic Study to make the application complete.
2. Applicant did not submit a new set of plans with the new layout on it; therefore, cannot determine where and if additional test pits are needed plans sheets should be provided.
3. Provide the Board with some documentation on lot 3 to determine lot depth.
4. Provide the Board with documentation how you determined lot depth on lot 1.
5. Provide the Board with documentation how you determined lot depth on lot 2.
6. Additional Test pits.

5/13/21  
**Date**

  
**Patricia Losik, Chairman**  
**Rye Planning Board**

## **LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, May 5, 2021**

**10:30 a.m. – via ZOOM**

***Members Present:* Chair Steve Carter, Katy Sherman, Rob Wright & Alternate Patricia Losik**  
***Ad hoc Members for the VS Committee:* Dominque Winebaum & Kathryn Garcia**

***Also Present:* Planning/Zoning Administrator Kim Reed and Julie LaBranche from Rockingham Planning Commission**

### **I. Call to Order**

Chair Carter called the meeting to order at 10:30 p.m. He noted that the meeting is to get an update from Julie LaBranche in regards to the timetable and the questionnaires. He is hoping the Committee can give her some input as to where the questions ought to be headed. The goal is to get the survey out to the boards and committees by some time in June, so they can get the surveys back and move along to the public responses.

Patricia Losik stated that as the chair of the Planning Board, she would like to review the Planning Board Rules of Procedure. The sub-committee is advisory. Its purpose is to evaluate, discuss and reach consensus on the Master Plan Vision Chapter update efforts. The sub-committee's work can go through the LRP. The LRP consists of three voting members; Katy Sherman, Steve Carter and Rob Wright. The LRP is one of three standing committees, which organize and facilitate the work of the Planning Board. In the past, the committee have encouraged citizen participation in formulating policies, by gathering more information from different sources. The responsibilities for the TRC, LRP and Rules and Regulations are assigned by law to the full Planning Board. She envisions a collaborative, consensus building effort. This will be a great project, as they go through and get this into a framework which will result in an updated vision chapter for next spring.

### **II. Update**

Chair Carter asked Julie LaBranche, Rockingham Planning Commission, to give an update to the Committee. He noted that the Committee received the 2002 survey questions, results and the report. He pointed out that a lot of the same items are still a concern for residents. He also pointed out that Ms. LaBranche has been getting help from Scott Marion and Stacey Smith.

Referring to the 2002 survey, Ms. LaBranche stated that she has not had time to go through the results. A lot of the survey is probably not relevant; however, it can be used as a guide. She would suggest selecting only questions from that survey that are still relevant and adding new questions.

Planning Administrator Reed commented that the 2002 survey and results was sent for informational purposes.

Ms. LaBranche stated that she would like to go over organization and timeframe with the Committee. She would also like to talk about the outreach events. She is hoping to get a sense of what the priority issues are for both the town staff/board and community surveys. It is going to take some time to develop the community survey. She would like some direction from this Committee as to the big issues and objectives. Generally, the community surveys are kept to ten to fifteen questions.

### **III. Gannt Chart & Discussion on the questionnaire and progress**

Ms. LaBranche presented the Gannt chart on the screen for the Committee's review. She noted that she needs to add outreach to the town staff and boards to the chart. There has been some discussion about doing two different surveys based on different objectives; however, she is not sure that is a great idea. She thinks one survey is enough and two may be confusing.

Chair Carter explained that 'Public Survey #1' listed on the chart, is the survey that was being considered for the committees and commissions. The goal was to get the town one out the middle of June, so they could get responses back over the summer while they got the survey out to the public.

Member Sherman stated she assumes that the survey that is going out to the boards will help to define what will go out to the public.

Ms. LaBranche replied she thinks they are two very different things.

Member Wright stated his recollection is that the survey to the town committees and boards was to backstop what had already been proposed within their purview and from their perspective what was important as people invested in some form of the operation of this.

Chair Carter explained the idea was to get an idea from the boards and commissions about what their top issues are from the committees' perspective, not an individual perspective. The Committee would have that information when they looked at the input from the people in town about what they feel is important.

Ms. LaBranche commented the questions for the town survey would be more like "what are you concentrating on in your work plan for the next couple of years (long range)" and "what are your goals and objectives to long-term planning for the Town?" Those answers could be compiled together to see how they interact and that can be incorporated into the master plan vision.

Chair Carter stated the total sum of the surveys would go into inputting what is going to be done in the actual visioning session in late September or October. The surveys were to provide overall input for the process and input for structuring the actual visioning session.

Ms. LaBranche stated the town survey could be developed in May and it can go out by the end of May with feedback coming in the middle of June. Results of that survey can be compiled in July. The timing for getting the public survey out is July and August with results coming back and being compiled in September. In regards to the public visioning session, it is still up in the air as to whether it will be by video or not in September.

There was some discussion about the timing of the visioning session, which was originally intended to be in late September or October. Ms. LaBranche recommended targeting September for the visioning session, so the results can come out in October for the Committee to review and incorporate them into the framework. This would give the Committee two months in order to do that, as the work needs to be completed for December.

The Committee agreed with the timeframe laid out in the Gantt chart.

Member Winebaum noted that the current vision chapter is about two pages long. She would like an idea about how extensive the framework is going to be, in terms of work that will be needed.

Member Sherman stated that she envisions the vision chapter to be a gateway into the rest of the Master Plan.

Member Winebaum commented that it is going to be more extensive than it has been in the past and is going to cover more issues. She would just like an idea of how extensive it is going to be.

Ms. LaBranche replied it is hard to predict in advance. The previous vision chapter was pretty bare bones and was basically a list of bulleted items. There was some brief discussion in previous meetings about transforming the vision chapter from a topical sort of document into more of a theme-based document. One of the jobs would be to take the town survey, public survey and visioning session to distill that information down into themes. In initial conversations with the Long Range Planning Committee, this is where they wanted to head. She continued that she would like to talk about whether this is still a goal of the Committee.

Member Wright asked for clarification between a topical list and a theme-based list.

Ms. LaBranche explained that topical list is the way the current Rye Master Plan is organized. Its by the traditional land use topics; such as, vision, land use, transportation, environment and energy. Those things are all individual chapters of a master plan. Theme based approaches are more like maintaining community character and how that is done, sustainability and resiliency planning, growth management and community services. It is a big umbrella of topics, under which a lot of things lie and there is also a lot of crossover. It would be putting things more

under how they are actually implemented and function in the community. She noted that she will send the Committee some examples from Exeter and Portsmouth, who have morphed from a topical based master plan to a thematic based master plan. She further explained that one of the impetus for communities to go to a more streamlined version of a master plan is that the old version of the topical chapters can be well over 100 pages, which is so inaccessible for people, boards and town staff. It is not an efficient way of defining the community's goals, objectives or priorities. It would have a little less detail but it has more cohesiveness and coordination. She commented this would really go to the kinds of questions that should be asked in the community survey. They may be broad based questions that cover a lot of ground and have people thinking about things holistically.

Member Winebaum stated that implementation is a huge part of the process. She would just like some context as to where they are going. In terms of trying to get it done after all the results are gathered, if it is more of a theme, it might require a lot more knowledge and work.

Planning Administrator Reed explained that right now, in 2021, the goal is to find out from the departments, residents and all of Rye, what they want Rye to become. Once all the data is received and a visioning chapter is created by December, they can then plan for 2022 the next step for the Master Plan. This is just one aspect of the process. She noted that they did not receive the PREPA Grant, so they need to stay focused on the visioning with RPC and Ms. LaBranche's assistant. Once they have this chapter, they can decide what needs to be done to move forward to create an awesome master plan that the Town of Rye can get their arms around. This will be done by taking into account all the answers received from the town departments and residents of Rye who participate in the visioning session. She reiterated they need to stay focused on the visioning. By looking at the other towns and what they are doing is helpful in trying to generate the questions. However, they have to be careful they are not trying creating the master plan right now. Right now, they are creating a vision for how to create a master plan.

Member Winebaum commented that she personally disagrees. She does not think they have to have a visioning in order to determine what kind of master plan it is going to be and what the needs are. She pointed out there are certain factors that inform the visioning; such as, growth and demographics. In looking at the population growth, how would that fit into the visioning?

Planning Administrator Reed commented that hopefully they will have the data from the 2020 Census to figure out the demographics. She asked the other members of the Committee if they agree or disagree on the focus.

Chair Carter commented this has been his sense of what they are trying to do. The Committee is really trying to find out what the town thinks at this point to give some direction for 2022. If the Master Plan is going to be redone, they are really going to need a consultant. It is going to take a lot of work and a lot more data. Speaking to Ms. LaBranche, he asked if the public could be moved back a month to mid-June, so the results could be collected by the end of July. That would give more time.

Ms. LaBranche commented it may be tight to do that in June; however, it could probably be done. She asked if everyone on the Committee will be involved in developing the survey. She asked if they are going to rely on LRP meetings to do that. She explained that surveys usually take about a month to do and then they have to be put into the web survey platform. There are always revisions done during that time frame. If the whole LRP would like to be involved in developing the survey, they would need to schedule several meetings to do that.

Ms. LaBranche suggested that the group brainstorm about what the objectives are for the survey. She noted that the town survey and community survey are really two different things. The town survey should ask the departments what their needs, challenges and plans are. The community survey would look at objectives for an overarching vision chapter for a master plan, which lays the groundwork across many different goals and topics. Ms. LaBranche gave examples of the types of questions that would be used on a public survey.

Chair Carter stated that one thing they could do is poll people as to what topics they should ask questions about in regards to the town.

Member Wright commented that in the last meeting, he thought they had sublet that work to Julie and Steve to come up with those questions. He asked if they are going to workshop the questions right now.

Ms. LaBranche replied that she is asking for objectives. From a high-level point of view, what are the sorts of things the Committee hopes to come away with.

Member Wright stated his perspective is that he has seen change in Rye over 30 years. There are components to the change which were outcomes of regulatory and legal decisions. There were other components that were outcomes of market forces; such as, real estate development and migration from and to the town of small business. There are market forces that drive the status of the town and there are governmental/regulatory forces that drive it. The things that they can impact, as members of government, is the governmental/regulatory piece. The market will be impacted by those decisions, as well as, economic forces. All of that ends up being what the town is and it drives people's feelings about it. Generally, the hope is to have people who live here, who have lived here and who might live here, like it and feel that they have been represented and heard, and feel that the town is moving in the direction they generally agree with.

Member Winebaum stated she is very concerned about sustainability; having enough water, having enough sewage and the capacity of the transfer station. Could Rye have a more sustainable approach in its development, transportation, water usage, etc.?

Member Sherman stated she agrees on sustainability. She thinks water is something they really need to detail more and perhaps have that an item in the visioning chapter.



Member Wright asked if those are more topics. He was thinking more of; “Why do you live in Rye? What do you like? What don’t you like? What makes you happy to be here?” He thinks those sorts of things are more the thematic outcome. From those inputs, they will derive things like “Does Rye have a sustainable plan for environmental concerns?”, which will drive micro actions. The macro questions are; “What is the reason you are here? What are the reasons that make it good? What are the reasons that make it less good?” From that, they will get what actions need to be taken to make it better for all, from a consensus perspective. Everyone is going to have a different view on development which drives resource conservation. He agrees the subject of water is very important, but that is one topic. It is not an overarching sense of a question.

Member Winebaum stated that she thinks sustainability can cover a lot of elements. She sees sustainability as a big umbrella.

Ms. LaBranche agreed.

Chair Carter stated that one of the questions to people should be; “What do you like about Rye?” Under that, another question should be about sustainability and questions about controlling growth, etc. The big topics are “Why do you like living here?” He would then ask; “What is the Town not doing that you think it should be doing?” He pointed out that some of this has to be multiple choice; otherwise, it will take the next ten years to compile the results. He also suggested the question; “What outside forces are pushing Rye in the wrong direction? How would those forces be commanded to keep Rye the way it is? How do you think Rye should change?” There could also be a question about sustainability, as it covers a lot of stuff. He thinks drinking water is a huge issue to think about. There are also questions around sustainability that involves sewers and septic, which drives how the town can be developed.

Member Wright stated this is looking for answers to strategic questions, not tactical issues. The tactical issues will sort themselves out if they understand the strategy. Someone receiving this survey is a citizen of the Town for Rye, N.H. As a citizen, “how do you feel about living here?” He thinks the Committee needs to come up with the subcategories.

Chair Carter stated the other big issue is the conservation issue. He thinks the need for more tax money, which happens when people develop land, pushes against the desire to have more open space and conservation land. If it goes too much in one direction, the town doesn’t have any money. If it goes too much in the other direction, it is not a great place to live. This is all related to sustainability; particularly, where Rye is located with all the water flowing in and out of the ocean.

Referring to broad-based questions, Ms. LaBranche stated that they have to be careful because the questions are front loaded as to what they can choose. It is sort of pushing the outcome a bit.

Member Wright suggested that a question to the citizens could be; “Where do your preferences lie? Development of land or conservation of open spaces.” That is a very fundamental, top view kind of question. He asked if this would be put on a survey.



Ms. LaBranche replied that she thinks in a lot of people's minds it is very hard to choose.

Member Sherman commented she likes that question. She asked if it could be done on a slider scale for ranking.

Chair Carter stated that another question he would be interested in is; "Would you be in favor of more business/commercial development, in an appropriate way, in and around Rye?" He thinks diversifying the tax base is a very important question. The question is what kind of commercial development would the citizens of Rye be in favor of.

Member Garcia stated that she takes more of a big picture look at visioning. One of the big objectives needs to be how to get people involved in answering the questions. To do that, it almost takes some kind of rallying point or looking at how to get the broad-based spectrum of residents involved. That is what they really need to hear about. There are many ways to craft questions for that. There are also community efforts that could be put out there; such as, a visioning board where people use one word to say what the community is. Many times, if school children are involved, parents will become involved. She would be happy to lend her skills to that effort, if the Committee thinks it is something that could work. She reiterated that a huge objective is how to get people involved in answering the questions.

Ms. LaBranche stated that they could actually incorporate something like that into the survey, where people are required to put in one word. She continued that they have to be aware that this is only an \$8,000 project. They are trying to do some targeted public outreach, targeted outreach to the town staff and boards, and coming up with a framework for what the broad-based objectives and goals are and topical issues are for the visioning chapter. That is the end point, so it can't be spread out too far because the cost would escalate well beyond the budget. She stated that it would be really interesting to ask the question about public involvement on the survey. She thinks that would be a really powerful question and would be interesting to hear what people have to say about it.

Chair Carter stated that he thinks one of the questions should have to do with the composition of the town and who lives in the town. In order to get the feeling of having open space and because of the septic requirements, the town has large lots. When there are large lots, they cost a lot of money and big house are put up to make it worthwhile. This excludes a lot of young families from being a part of Rye. Do people like that or would they rather have a better mix? How is that going to happen? He also noticed from the survey of 2002, people did not want condos or apartment buildings, which is what is being developed out on Route 1, which provides affordable housing for some people. He thinks the composition of Rye should be a question.

Member Winebaum commented there is also the issue of Airbnb. There are a lot of opportunities for people to capitalize on their housing. This diminishes the amount of affordable housing. There may need to be some kind of regulation to help with more affordable housing. In reading the 1985 Master Plan, it says that Route 1 should be commercial and industrial, not to have housing. Then later on, the affordable housing was specifically located off Route 1. She asked if this needs to be changed. This is in the Land Use Regulations.

Ms. LaBranche stated the idea of Airbnb rentals for short-term summer vacationers, is really a different question than affordable housing for Workforce Housing. She thinks this gets to the question of economic forces. People are attracted to the money they can make on very high rental units during the summer. That is a difficult thing in that it does not provide stability for affordable housing and that is not really the purpose. People who have property at the beach are trying to maximize their profit during the summer months. She thinks it would be interesting to ask people a housing question and it would be pertinent to the survey.

Member Sherman stated that she thinks everyone says they want more affordable housing, but then they say they do not want it next door to them. She asked if it would be possible to come up with a few topics for the public survey for Ms. LaBranche to work on. She feels like they are getting off topic a bit.

Member Wright asked if they are writing the questions and coming up with the subjects.

Ms. LaBranche explained they are trying to outline the objectives for the survey and what the big ticket items the Committee would like to know about. She highlighted some topics brought up from this discussion:

- **What do you like about Rye? Do you think it is moving in the right direction?**  
**This may be an open-ended question, multiple choice or ranking.**
- **Sustainability and what it means to the community.**  
**List out what sustainability means in different ways.**
- **Housing options, Workforce and affordable housing.**
- **Land conservation and resource conservation.**
- **Economic development. Is the Town in favor of more commercial development and zoning in certain places? Where would that happen?**
- **Is it important for the community to be more inclusive to foster a more broad-based participation for decision making?**
- **Coastal adaptation and resilience.**

Ms. LaBranche explained that she could develop some questions from these topics that are editable in a Word Document so everyone can review them and send changes or revisions. There may be some wiggle room to add some more topics.

Chair Carter suggested a question be; "What do you see as the most concerning threat to the Town of Rye?" He thinks they could list some things and have the people rank them.

Ms. LaBranche agreed this would be a really good question. It could be an open-ended question. There could be one field for external issues and one for internal issues. She thinks they would get some really great feedback.

There was some discussion on how the question would be formed on the survey.

Member Sherman asked if this would be the place to ask, as a follow up question, if people would be willing to spend more money to have certain services. "Would you be willing to pay more taxes to have more conservation land or safer drinking water?"

It was agreed this would be a good question. Ms. LaBranche suggested having this be the last question asked on the survey.

Speaking to Member Garcia, Ms. LaBranche asked what the question would be for a visioning board for them to respond with one word.

Member Garcia explained this was applied in the previous community she lived in. The board moved around town and people would write down what was most important to them. There are so many things that a community can provide. She continued that in terms of involving people, by having the visioning board and moving it around, it was a way to get people involved and thinking about it.

Member Wright stated that he would like to see an open-ended question; "What do you like about Rye? What are you hopeful about? What is not good?" He thinks this may be a way to get Member Garcia's desired result, without having to physically move something around.

Member Winebaum asked if the schools should be part of the questionnaire.

Ms. LaBranche replied they did not talk about municipal services; which would include, roads, schools, drinking water, sewer, emergency services, etc. It could even include things like broadband and cell phone coverage.

Planning Administrator Reed commented this would be a very good question.

Referring back to the visioning board, Ms. LaBranche stated there may be a way to incorporate the concept that was mentioned by Member Wright. What do you feel is Rye's most positive attribute? What do you feel needs to be improved? She will look into ways to create a visioning board.

#### **IV. Next Steps**

Julie LaBranche will take the thought taken from the discussion at this meeting and form 10 to 15 draft questions for the public survey. These questions will be emailed out to the Committee for their comments and changes. Ms. LaBranche will start working on the town staff survey with Scott Marion and Stacey Smith, which will be done via email. All correspondence regarding the draft questions will flow through the Planning Administrator.

#### **V. Other** *None*

- **Next Meeting – Tuesday, May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2:30 p.m.**

### **Adjournment**

**Chair Carter adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.  
All were in favor.**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dyana F. Ledger