TOWN OF HOLDERNESS
Planning Board Meeting Minutes: August 18, 2026

Bill Nesheim, Chair called the regular Planning Board meeting to order at 5:30 PM

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:
Members Present: Bill Nesheim, Angi Francesco, Brian O'Connell, J. Gilchrist, Janet Cocchiaro, Clayton Titus and Michael Salmon, Alt. and Ron Huntoon, Alt.
Members Absent: Peter Francesco,
Present: Matt Hayden, Ina Ahern, Julie Kelsey, Scott Fields, Lisetta Silvestri, A. Barnard and Darren Siek

NEW BUSINESS:

Approval of minutes July 21, 2026 meeting.
Added a correction to page 3, paragraph 5 "behind the buildings TO build…" instead of do build.
B. O'Connell made a motion to accept as amended, A. Francesco seconded the motion, motion passed 6 – Yes 0 – No

Approval of minutes August 4, 2026 meeting.
A. Francesco made a motion to accept as written, J. Cocchiaro seconded the motion, motion passed 6 – Yes 0 – No

The Chair announced the continuation of the public hearing on Case # 2026-06-01, Huckins Hill subdivision.

The chair asked the audience if there were any comments or questions. S. Fields questioned the status of Huckins Hill as a Class VI Road since the Select Board had previously stated it was not.

B. Nesheim stated that the Select Board, at their meeting of July 27, 2026 indicated that Huckins Hill Road is a Class VI unmaintained town road based on research. Its status as a Class VI Road is documented in all state records and at the registry of deeds for properties on the road. As far as the Planning Board is concerned it is a Class VI Road.

Hearing no other comments or questions the chair closed the public hearing at 5:45 pm.

B. Nesheim distributed a document entitled Subdivision Approval Note that he developed as guidance for reviewing this application. This document is incorporated into the record. He further walked the board members through the document and explained the reasoning behind the conditions he proposed to be placed on a subdivision on a class VI Road regarding maintenance and level of improvement.

A. Francesco made a motion to approve the subdivision conditionally upon the subdivider writing road maintenance covenants to be reviewed by the town's attorney prior to sign off on the plan for recording the subdivision. Also, a condition to repair any damage caused by construction on the lots.

Discussion ensued about the road agent having already granted three driveway permits, the base line of existing conditions, that the road agent should determine such condition and the developer's plans for improving the driveways and do the site clearing for a future home site.

B. Nesheim stated that at full buildout there will be additional traffic and that we should make sure the condition of the roadway was good enough for the additional traffic.

C. Titus stated he would want the wording on the covenants be such that the new property owner would only be responsible for their portion of the road.

Further discussion on offering this maintenance agreement to other residents, to not "kick the can" down the road given the current opportunity to establish such an agreement which would protect the town and the fact that state law governs the "Do No Harm" mandate to protect the town roads.

A. Francesco amended her motion to approve stating that the condition would be a note on the plan stating that any damage due to construction by the lot owners would need to follow state law as contained in RSA 236:38 and 39

D. Siek and the members discussed winter maintenance with all agreeing that the six people that current live on the road are already handling.

C. Titus seconded the amended motion requiring a note on the plan.

J. Kelsey a resident at 311 Mt. Prospect Rd on the corner of Huckins Hill stated that it is hard to deal with nine property owners voluntarily and that the covenants should be required rather than only a good faith effort to obtain agreement.

The board continued the discussion on how much of the road would need to be improved, what would be reasonable conditions and how the select board is best placed to make those determinations.

A. Francesco stated that improvement and maintenance should be required up to the last driveway proposed from Mt. Prospect. C. Titus stated he did not feel the planning board had the ability to require that. B. Nesheim stated he felt the board could require maintenance covenants but only on the new 3 lots being created this and noted that abutters do have valid concerns about future maintenance.

B. Nesheim presented an amendment to the amended motion that there shall be a note placed on the plans noting that these lots are subject to RSA 636:39 the subdivision be approved with a recommendation to form a formal maintenance agreement with all property owners on the road.

A. Francesco seconded the motion, the amendment to the amended motion was approved 6 – Yes 0 – No.

B. Nesheim further clarified the motion that the plan note should refer to the civil liability provision of RSA 236:39 and that the board recommends that the subdivider draft a road maintenance agreement to present to the neighbors and sends a copy of such to the planning board.

The amended motion was seconded by C. Titus, motion passed 6 – Yes 0 – No

The board acknowledged concerns expressed by audience members regarding closing or preventing access by some property owners to portions of the road and noted that these concerns should be brought to the attention of the Select Board.

Case # 2026 -07-01 - Lisetta Silvestri as agent for the Jean Louise Doyle Trust for a request to subdivide an existing parcel by removing a condition of merger to create two separate lots. Tax parcels known as Map/Lot 240-024-000 and 240-024-001 located at 15 Hemlock Way.

The chair opened the public hearing at 6:45 pm.

A. Francesco made a motion to accept the application as complete, J. Cocchiaro seconded the motion, motion passed 6 – 0 Yes – No

B. Nesheim stated that Perkins Lane was a private road and inquired as to both properties having an existing recorded ROW.

L. Silvestri stated that they did. She further stated that no merger of these lots was recorded, that the 10.4-acre parcel as shown on the BLA plan has a conservation easement. She is requesting that the board approve of removing the notation on the BLA plan that refers to the lots being merged.

A. Barnard the registered surveyor that submitted the original BLA to the Planning Board in November, 2003 stated that a subsequent BLA on an abutting property in 2022 clearly indicate that these two parcel are merged. Additionally, he stated that a notice of lot merger was filed with the registry in 2019. He also produced two deeds that describe the parcels and include restrictions on further subdivision of lots less than five acres and that the lots 240- 24 be merged with 240-29 and shall not be considered a separate lot. He also stated, that the property is subject to a view easement which has not been discussed. Mr. Barnard further stated that based on his review of the application a full subdivision plan should be submitted and that the planning board "waiving" the condition is not sufficient.

B. Nesheim stated that he felt that this meets the subdivision requirements, that the water front portion is already established, the lot they are creating is greater than one acre and they have a recorded ROW easement for both lots.

A. Barnard stated that the applicant would need NHDES approval for a lot of less than five acres on the lake, that the lot is encumbered by a view easement, that they would need to submit a subdivision plan and they can not use his 2003 BLA plan as such.

L. Silvestri stated she is just asking for the board to waiver the restriction that imposed in 2003.

C. Titus does not believe that removing the restriction would fix this.

A. Barnard reiterated that they would need NHDES approval, that the view easement should be considered that there are restrictive covenants on further subdivision and he objects to the applicant using his plan to request a subdivision approval.

L. Silvestri responded that the attorneys for this applicant feel that a condition of the planning board could be waived on the merger condition, that it doesn't change what is on the ground now and that their goal is to facilitate a donation of 10.4 acres to SLCS.

A. Barnard again responded that he felt the board did not have that authority, that they need to file a subdivision plan, and state approval which may necessitate a lot loading easement.

C. Titus reviewed the subdivision checklist submitted and stated that many of the items indicated as N/A may in deed be required or the applicant may request a formal waiver of said requirements noting that the surveyor is not granting permission to use his plan.

A. Francesco stated that this application should be continued to obtain advice from town counsel.

C. Titus stated that they can ask the applicant to complete the subdivision checklist submitting the necessary documents or requested specific waivers of those requirements. Since this public hearing has already notice abutters, it would not need to be re-advertised if it were to be continued.

L. Silvestri stated that her client would not agree to that and asked that the board request an opinion from town counsel.

B. Nesheim stated that the board can consult town counsel and that the applicant can show up at the next hearing either with the waivers or required documents or without them as they so choose.

A. Francesco requested that the applicant provide a summary of their position for the board to forward to town counsel and continue the hearing, and that the applicant should either request waivers or submit a new plan.

C. Titus stated that the board can grant waivers but can't create an illegal subdivision, and that all parties do their homework to see how we can get through this process. B. Nesheim stated he is concerned with doing this properly to protect the existing and future owners.

A. Francesco made a motion to continue the public hearing till the regular Sept. 15th meeting, and allow both parties, planning board and applicant to gather additional information.

C. Titus seconded the motion, motion passed 6 – Yes 0 – No.

B. Nesheim reviewed the correspondence receive from NHDOT and NHDES, and the board approved payment of the invoice received from T. Bamford for work completed on the master pla.
There was no other business to come before the Board, A. Francesco made a motion to adjourn, J. Cocchiaro seconded the motion, motion passed 6 – Yes 0 – No.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:25 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Lucinda M. Hannus
Land Use Assistant