

Planning Board
February 17, 2026
FINAL

Board Members Present: Chris Millette, Chair, Chris Hernick, Vice Chair; Gary Keane, Wayne Seaholm, Richard Wright, Members.

Town Personnel: Donna Long, Recording Secretary

Public: George Chadwick, Aran Lafontaine, Whitney Hilton, Dan Brutga, Amy Campbell, Trevor Kaye, Abbie Celniker, Nancy Stepvoe, John Quinn, Greg Swick, Dave Rhodes, Tim Jurien, Steve Bourque, Stefanie Stote, Deena Bello, Ward Bennett, Eric Sneider, Karina Schneider, Elizabeth Harper, Tom Perron, Kelley Perron, Kirk Bishop, and others.

ADMINISTRATIVE:

Minutes:

The Board reviewed the minutes from the January 20, 2026, Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Seaholm made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Mr. Wright seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Millette stated that they were going to switch around the cases because they need to look at the preliminary design review site plan before moving onto the conditional use permit case.

Mr. Hernick looked through the application for completeness. After review, Mr. Hernick found the application complete.

Mr. Hernick made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Wright seconded the motion. All were in favor.

7:10 p.m. – Case 2026-001- Preliminary Design Review Site Plan – OKB, LLC (owner), db Landscaping and Bedford Design (agents) for Preliminary Design Review – Site Plan proposing six detached hotel units/cabins located at Route 103B, Newbury NH, Tax Map 007-579-239.

Mr. Chadwick (representing OKB, LLC) approached the Board. He explained they are looking to put in hotel units that will be attached to a foundation and will have permanent utilities. Mr. Chadwick said although they will be put in by a trailer, the wheels will come off and they will be permanent. He explained that stormwater will be captured in an infiltration trench. Mr. Chadwick said there is a small gathering space that is a pervious product either pavers or stonedust. They said they have submitted their state permits. The septic permit is approved pending the shoreland permit being approved.

Ms. Lafontaine went over how they are trying to buffer the road and neighbors with trees and plantings. There will be plantings around each unit with native plant materials and they will make it a true NH landscape.

Mr. Chadwick said they will be putting things in phases.

Mr. Wright said he would like to see the entire project done before guests start using it so the guests are not dealing with machinery while they are staying at the property.

Mr. Millette said he would like to have a time limit on when they would be all complete.

Mr. Millette said it is a commercial use in the business district bordering the town of Sunapee. He said it is not a requirement for a preliminary, but it would need be noticed.

Mr. Millette said there needs to be flagging so the Board members can go out and look before final approval.

Mr. Millette asked if there are any designated units for handicapped use. Mr. Brutga said they can look into it but they didn't need it for another project they have recently done.

Mr. Millette asked about the density requirements and the shoreland ratio. He thinks there is an error in L5. The map is showing 27% in the shoreland permit and it has to be 50% unaltered according to Town Regulations 7.8.2.1.2 in the Shoreland section. Mr. Brutga said they do meet it and apologized they don't have that drawing so they will send it in. Mr. Brutga said this was the map given to the State. Mr. Millette said the calculation shouldn't change and the math does not match up and he doesn't understand how they would have different numbers for the State drawing. Mr. Millette said the natural woodland buffer to remain is not enough. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Keane asked about the maintenance building. He asked if there would be a bathroom in there. Mr. Chadwick said it will have a sink.

Mr. Keane asked about driveway one and driveway two.

Mr. Millette said he couldn't find a plan what it was going to look like grading-wise when it is finished. Mr. Hernick said it is on sheet 3. He asked if there is one that doesn't show the existing contour lines in the area that are going to be altered.

Mr. Chadwick said all the buildings are around 11 – 23 elevation.

Mr. Millette opened up the public input.

Mr. Sneider had a question regarding the drawing. He said there is a dark bold line that is labeled 'edge of lake' and it is beyond the edge of the lake. Mr. Millette deferred to Mr. Chadwick. Mr. Chadwick said it is the edge of the lake of when they surveyed it. Sometimes the lake comes in higher.

Ms. Selecker asked about the grading. Mr. Millette said they need to get State approval and they have no say over that. Mr. Chadwick said they have received approvals from the State for the septic system and said they are in compliance.

Mr. Rhodes said the Newbury Conservation Commission has significant concern regarding the application they received last Friday. Some of the concerns they have are from Bob Stewart who is the Vice Chair and a certified wetlands scientist. Mr. Rhodes said the application was updated on the 28th of last month and the NCC did not receive the application that should have been done for DHS. He said the conditional use permit does not indicate square footage impact. Mr. Millette said that is a different hearing.

Mr. Rhodes said residential density should be considered. The Commissioners said the minimum density should be 2 acres per unit. The proposal does not appear to meet zoning and might need to go to ZBA for approval.

Mr. Rhodes said that also a stormwater plan has not been sent to NCC.

Mr. Millette said this is a preliminary hearing and so a continuation is not needed since it is not a final hearing.

Mr. Quinn stated he wrote two letters. The first letter was a concern that was when it was first brought to the State it was supposed to be a 4-bedroom house. He is wondering how much approval from the State was with this first proposal and not a hotel/cabins.

Mr. Quinn said that it was originally supposed to be pervious material and this plan calls for pavement. He also said that there was no notification for the proposal that first went to the State. Mr. Millette said this is the first step in the process.

Mr. Quinn brought up several points regarding the shoreland and the disruption to wildlife and Mr. Millette said the Planning Board has no authority here any of these things.

Mr. Quinn said he is concerned about sand coming in from Route 103 and going into the lake.

Mr. Quinn said there should be a management presence on the site. He is also concerned about the number of people that would be coming in.

Mr. Quinn said he is concerned about an unmanned firepit. Mr. Millette said there are regulations regarding burning and that cover this.

Mr. Swick said he had sent in a couple of letters. He said he thinks the Sunapee Board should be involved in this process. Additionally, all the water in this land is going into Lake Sunapee.

Mr. Millette said the Town of Newbury's zoning is what will be followed and it is not needed to include the Sunapee Planning Board.

Mr. Swick said he sent a letter regarding the fact that it is in the business district. Mr. Millette said Route 103 B is all in the business district.

Mr. Swick stated another letter that he sent was regarding a minimum 200' of lake frontage. Mr. Millette said this is not a new lot and was part of a larger lot that was partly in Sunapee and it was divided in two.

Mr. Bennett asked if everything on Route 103B is commercial and Mr. Millette said yes.

Mr. Perin asked if there is any kind of boat launch on this property. Mr. Chadwick said there is an approved dock but there is no launch.

Mr. Bennett asked if there will be kayaks for the renters to use. Mr. Millette said that is not in their jurisdiction.

Mr. Swick is double checking in that this is not a new lot and Mr. Millette said that is their interpretation.

Mr. Hernick read the following letter from Dave B. Campbell.:

Hi Darren,

It was nice speaking with you last week about the above-reference Planning Board item, I appreciate your willingness to present this email/letter to the Planning Board and make it and the attachments part of the record.

As way of introduction, I am an owner of a cottage on Mountain View Lake where my family has owned property since the 1940's. I am also a long-time member of the unincorporated/volunteer Mountain View Lake Protection Association and have been a land-use attorney in New Hampshire for 27 years. My comments are not offered in any capacity other than from me, as an individual.

I have several concerns regarding the Site Plan that is being considered by the Planning Board:

1. The Impact of Water Quality on both Mountain View Lake and Lake Sunapee: This site has frontage on Mountain View Lake and is extremely proximate to the Mountain View dam from which Chandler Brook flows downstream, under Route 103-B and outlets directly into Lake Sunapee adjacent to the New Hampshire State Beach. Chandler Brook, which runs through this site and discharges water from Mountain View Lake and the wetland on the subject site (which comprises about one-third of the site's acreage) into Lake Sunapee.
2. Designating this Proposal as a Development of Regional Impact: NH RSA 36.55: states: "...development of regional impact" means any proposal before a local land use board which is the determination of such local land use board could reasonably be expected to impact on a neighboring municipality, because of factors such as, but no limited to, the following: 1. Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock. 2. Proximity to the borders of

a neighboring community. 3. Transportation networks. 4. Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles. 5. Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries.

I respectfully request the Planning Board consider this site plan proposal as a “development of regional impact” given the frontage or proximity of this proposal to the Mountain View Lake and Lake Sunapee, which affects all the lake residents and properties located on these two water bodies, not only in Newbury, but in the Sunapee and New London as well. I understand the Sunapee Planning Board is favorable to such a designation, but the decision is ultimately up to the Newbury Planning Board.

3. Tax Map 007-579-239 Appears to be a Non-Conforming Lot under Newbury Zoning Requirements: When this lot was subdivided in 2003-2004 in the Towns of Newbury and Sunapee it appears that the subdivision was improper in that the Newbury lot has insufficient frontage on Mountain View Lake (either 68.7 acres according to the subdivision plan dated December 4, 2002, prepared by Bristol, Sweet & Associates, or 136+ acres according to the Site Plan before the Board dated December 18, 2025, prepared by Bedford design – both Plans are attached.)

Either way, the lot does not meet the Newbury Zoning requirement of 200- feet of minimum frontage on the Lake and may require a variance before any development can be undertaken: “Newbury Zoning Ordinance: 7.4.1 Lake/Pond Shore Frontage Requirement: Every new lot shall have lake/pond shore frontage of not less than 200 feet per dwelling.” This is a subject that may need to be considered by the Town’s legal counsel.

4. Tax Map 007-579-239 is a Non-Conforming Lot under the State of NH’s Shoreland Water Quality Protection Statute – RSA 483-B:

RSA 483-B:9 V & (f): Minimum Shoreland Water Protection standards requires that new lots and undeveloped lots dependent on on-site septic within the protected shoreland “not be created with less than 150 feet of frontage on public water.” As shown earlier, this lot has less than 150 feet of frontage.

Regarding non-conforming lots RSA 483-B:10 goes on to state that “Building on nonconforming lots of record shall be limited to single family residential structures and related facilities.” (Relevant excerpts to RSA 482-B are attached). This issue also may require an opinion by legal counsel and will be separately addressed with NHDES.

I respectfully ask the Planning Board to suspend any further action on this agenda item until some of these issues can be fully addressed.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

David B. Campbell

Mr. Seaholm read the following email from Jeff and Allison Heath from Punta Gorda Florida.

Dear Boards,

As joint trustees owning land abutting db Landscaping LLC and Bedford Design (agents) for OKB (owner) we have had the opportunity to review the proposed plan for the 6 detached hotel-style lodgings to be submitted.

Both Mrs. Heath and I are fully supportive of this proposal. The land is zoning commercial and we feel the developer is entitled to exercise their rights to best use scenario following proper procedures with the town and state.

From a personal perspective we liked their hotel-style unit design and feel it blends well with the surrounding previously established commercial properties. The Blue Goose Inn comes to mind as it has offered much needed lodging for a long time.

Both Allisen and I appreciate the opportunity to express our support with both boards with this project.

Respectfully,

Allisen E. Heath, Trustee

Jeffrey J. Heath, Trustee

Mr. Millette closed the public input.

Mr. Millette said they will need a new plan with proper calculations.

Mr. Millette said 5.3.8.1 says the Planning Board needs to do a site visit. Mr. Millette asked the Board members what they would like to see. Mr. Seaholm would like to see the 75' wetland buffer line on the map.

Mr. Millette would like to see the building locations as well when they go out for the site visit.

Mr. Seaholm said he would like to see the pin for the far corner of the driveway pinned. Mr. Chadwick said they will flag the line of where the pavement will stop.

Mr. Chadwick asked if the Board prefers paved or not paved? Mr. Wright said he would prefer it not paved.

Mr. Millette would like to see where the basin is and the building locations.

Mr. Seaholm asked about the driveway. Mr. Chadwick said there is no driveway in yet.

Mr. Hernick asked if wetland flags were still hanging and Mr. Chadwick said they were.

Mr. Millette said he is not sure they would call these traditional. Mr. Millette said he does not think the Luna structure meets the requirements. He thinks the A-Frame is fine. 9.5 talks about structures that match NH's character.

The quality material and should have sloped roofs, etc. The Luna shells do not match what is called for in the site plan.

Mr. Millette brought up the lighting plan. He asked if the lighting is compliant with Newbury zoning. They said the lights would be about 6' tall.

Mr. Brutga asked what the Board would like for lighting. Mr. Millette said maybe there should be motion sensors so they are off until someone comes in. Mr. Hernick said they are pretty bright. Mr. Brutga said they will look into that. Mr. Quinn mentioned a hard timer would be more preferable because wildlife will set off a motion sensor and light pollution is a concern and someone said the lights should be pointed downward.

Mr. Brutga will look into other fixtures.

Mr. Millette would like them to look into handicap accessibility for some units.

Mr. Wright asked what the heat source is. Mr. Brutga said have mini splits.

Mr. Wright like to see a flag to where the well is going.

Mr. Chadwick said they can put out the flags within the next two weeks.

Mr. Millette proposed the Planning Board members go out individually so they do not need to post notice. The Board agreed. Mr. Chadwick will let the Board know when they are done flagging.

7:05 p.m. Case 2026-003-Conditional Use Permit OKB, LLC (owner), db Landscaping and Bedford Design (agents) for Final Approval Conditional Use Permit for development in a wetland buffer located at Route 103B, Newbury NH, Tax Map 007-579-239.

Mr. Millette reopened the hearing for the conditional use permit at 9:18 p.m. Mr. Millette said all the abutters were notified was not clear if they notified the NCC. Mr. Rhodes said the Planning Board did not. Mr. Hernick does not think there is a notice requirement for NCC.

Mr. Millette read the zoning ordinance regarding development in the wetland buffer and what the Board needs to be convinced.

Mr. Millette said the retention pond and roadway to the well is not on the map. He thinks those things need to be shown.

Mr. Millette reviewed the application for completeness. Mr. Millette found the application complete, even though it is not correct.

Mr. Hernick made a motion to accept the application. Mr. Wright seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Millette said they can grant the permit with a bunch of conditions, but he thinks it needs to show the Chandler Brook setbacks and the road to the well and the stormwater basin. Mr. Millette said they need to consider if they will allow them to have the driveway at 20' or if it needs to be changed.

Mr. Chadwick said they will add the things that are missing for the next meeting. Mr. Chadwick said they would put in a waiver for a 20' driveway.

Mr. Hernick thinks there is plenty of room. Mr. Millette said he is concerned about the impervious surfaces being put up against the drainage swales. Mr. Millette said the gravel will just wash over the swales. He thinks this needs to be addressed in some way with some impervious pavers.

Mr. Brutga said this is where the state says the driveway has to be and the water has to go somewhere. He thinks 20' is sufficient.

Mr. Millette said the other issue is the stormwater management plan. He asked Mr. Hernick asked if it is sufficient and Mr. Hernick said yes.

Mr. Millette asked about the snow loading and it is actually on the opposite side of the gravel and it will melt near the wetland. Mr. Millette said those are bigger areas capturing the snow water. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Millette asked about reducing some of the parking spaces.

Mr. Chadwick asked if they propose to make driveway 24' wide from road to the maintenance building than it go down to 20' and pave 24' feet as the entrance way and then the rest be 20' and gravel.

Mr. Millette suggested they adjourn this meeting and revisit in April.

Mr. Brutga would like the option to pave if necessary for maintenance purposes.

Mr. Millette opened public input.

Mr. Rhodes confirmed what they said regarding the conditional use and it does not indicate that there are some temporary impacts which the Board has already addressed. The only other thing of note is the buffer should be maintained in its current state.

Mr. Quinn said he has concerns about the chemicals going into the lake from Route 103B.

Mr. Swick made a point in which it is an activity that should happen in a series.

There being no other comment. Mr. Millette closed public input.

Mr. Hernick made a motion to continue the meeting on the conditional use permit until the April meeting so they can revise the plan to show the stormwater basin, the service road to the well and the increase width of the driveway up to the first unit. Mr. Keane seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Millette closed the public hearing.

Other Business:

Mr. Hernick made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Wright seconded the motion. **All in favor.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna S. Long
Recording Secretary

