

Planning Board Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Subcommittees serve in an advisory capacity only and does not take final action on behalf of the Planning Board.

Subcommittee Name: Architecture Subcommittee

Parent Board: Planning Board

Date: July 16, 2026

Time: 10:45 a.m. EST

Location: Town Office Conference Room

Names of Attendees: Anna Sandler, Jon Panichella, Morgan Diehm, James Sununu

Subcommittee Members: Anna Sandler, Jon Panichella, Morgan Diehm

Staff/Consultants: N/A

Public: James Sununu

Meeting Called to Order: By: Anna Sandler at 10:46 a.m.

Purpose of Meeting *(Briefly describe the purpose/scope of the subcommittee meeting)*

Review draft of architectural regulations for updates/redlines.

Summary of Subject Matter Discussed *(Summarize key topics discussed)*

The committee reviewed multiple sections of the draft regulation, clarified applicability, discussed design and development constraints, and gathered public input—especially regarding visual impact assessments, hard-surface limits, and submittal timing. The group also examined how the regulation may affect affordable housing and emphasized the goal of reducing subjectivity while supporting future development.

- Opened with review of the Applicability section, confirming regulation applies to both residential and commercial development. Discussion then moved to blank wall limitations, color requirements, and the LRV (Light Reflectance Value) scale, ensuring alignment with existing ordinance language and the town’s landscaping regulation.
- Within Section 7.2 “Visual Impact Assessment”, the committee received public feedback (referenced separately).
- Morgan D. joined after delivering materials on affordable housing. The conversation shifted to how revised regulations might affect development feasibility. Anna emphasized that the intent of the revision is to reduce subjectivity, support future development, and avoid overly prescriptive requirements.

Planning Board Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Subcommittees serve in an advisory capacity only and does not take final action on behalf of the Planning Board.

- The group then reviewed Sections 3.1 and 3.2 more closely, focusing on material-use requirements and whether they could unintentionally limit the ability to construct affordable housing.
- Concerns were raised about the low hard-surface percentage limits. Upon review, the group determined that the percentages were based on current LDR (Lower Density Residential) ordinance standards and that this section must be expanded to address other zoning districts.
- The committee discussed submittal timing, responding to public requests for clarity on whether requirements apply at the concept plan stage or site plan stage.

Next Steps / Action Items

- **Massing & Accessory Structure Standards** — Develop specific massing criteria and square-footage limits for accessory structures. Conduct a review of surrounding town regulations to establish consistent regional benchmarks.
- **Section 7.2 – Public Vantage Point Definition** — Add defining language clarifying “public vantage point.” Incorporate Jon P.’s recommendation for a 360-degree line-of-sight analysis at 30-degree intervals.
- **Section 3.3 – Limited Materials** — Review comparable town standards for synthetic material allowances. Evaluate increasing percentage limits for high-quality synthetic materials (e.g., LP SmartSide) to support affordability while maintaining aesthetic consistency.
- **Section 6 – Hard Surface Limitations** — Break down hard-surface percentage limits by zoning district. Current values reflect LDR only and must be expanded to MDR, HDR, commercial, and mixed-use zones.
- **Section 8 – Submittal Requirements** — Confirm with North Country Counsel that required documents are intended to be submitted at the site plan stage, not concept review.
- **Steep Slope Overlay Alignment** — Review the steep slope overlay district language for consistency with the revised regulation and identify any cross-references or alignment adjustments needed.

Public Comment (if applicable)

- 7.2 “Visual Impact Assessment” James S. request for clarity on public vantage points
- 3.3 “Limited Materials” James S. request for review of alternative synthetic products and manufactured materials that are more cost effective in development

Planning Board Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Subcommittees serve in an advisory capacity only and does not take final action on behalf of the Planning Board.

- 6 "Hard Surface Limitations" James S. noted that standard for commercial development is 60% limitation – Per C1 it is a 20% open space requirement
- 8 "Design Review Procedures" James S. asked for clarity on when document submittal should occur, at time of conceptual planning or when formal site plan request is submitted for review.

Time of Adjournment: 12:02 p.m. EST

- **Motion by:** _____
- **Seconded by:** _____
- **Vote:** _____

Certification

I hereby certify that these minutes are a true and accurate record of the subcommittee meeting.

- **Recorded by:** Anna Sandler
- **Date:** July 16, 2026