

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Town of Gilsum
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

April 22, 2026

10 **Board Present:** Tom Julius, Chair; Heidi Bukoski, Member; Kevin Barnes, Member; Brian Bazarnicki,
11 *Ex Officio*; and Carol Ogilvie, Alternate Member

12 **Also Present:** Linda and Dwayne Nettleton; Bill Whyte; Bruce Murphy; Jeremy Hockensmith (Town
13 Attorney); Ariane Ice (Attorney for G2 Holdings)

14 **CTO:** Tom called the meeting to order at 7:08 P.M. Tom noted there is a vacant seat on the Board. as Bill
15 Whyte just resigned from the Board. Carol noted that she is an alternate, but would be willing to fill the
16 vacant seat if no one else steps forward.

17 Tom raised a conflict of interest regarding Heidi, noting that the Board is dealing with matters having to do
18 with certain business interests in town. He noted that state law says that any member who has a direct
19 interest in a project should recuse themselves.

20 Heidi explained that her reason to recuse herself in any matter having to do with excavation or an application
21 is because she is an abutter to the existing gravel pit. She is still a resident and has interest, but will recuse
22 herself and will not participate in the Excavation Regulations review and will not vote on either the
23 Regulations or any application regarding G2 Holdings that might come before the Board.

24 Tom appointed Carol to serve as full member tonight.

25 **I. Procedures**

26 **a. Meeting Minutes**

27 Tom distributed the minutes of March 25, 2026 for the Board's review.

28 *On a motion by Brian Bazarnick/seconded by Kevin Barnes, the Board voted to approve the minutes of*
29 *March 25, 2026 with two spelling corrections, with all in favor.*

30 **II. Regulatory**

31 **a. G2 Excavation Updates**

32 Tom thanked the attendees for being present, since it is often the case that no one attends the Board
33 meetings. He briefly described the Planning Board responsibilities, and wants to ensure that people
34 recognize these parameters. He asked that if anyone wants to speak that they identify themselves, and speak
35 through the Chair.

36 Tom noted that the Board was in receipt of the letter from the Nettletons, and asked if anyone from the
37 public had any comments.

38 Linda and Dwayne Nettleton raised a number of issues they have been dealing with, including: water
39 quality; various environmental issues; impact on property values; lack of proper noticing for blasting; and
lack of vegetative buffering, among other concerns. Also, a neighbor has had a well gone dry.

Tom asked if anyone wished to respond to these comments, to which Ariane Ice had the following
comments:

40 This is a campaign of defamation, so she has no choice but to put her objections on the record. The Planning
41 Board is getting misinformation. The water testing has come back within proper limits. She respects that
42 the planning board is trying to do the right thing. But this is unfair to G2 Holdings that these claims are
43 made against them. This is a civil matter. There is no indication that G2 Holdings had any effect on the
44 wells. These complaints have been coming week after week, month after month. There is a process, if there
45 is a legitimate violation, the complainant needs to reach out to G2 Holdings. This has to stop. G2 has a
46 right to defend itself, and this is not the right forum.

47 Brian read a statement that was read at the BOS meeting. This was a legal opinion from the NH Municipal
48 Association that stated that the Town is not responsible for private property complaints, unless there is
49 proof of negligence on the part of the Town. This is something to be resolved between the land owner and
50 the business. It is not legal or appropriate that the Town solve this for the complaining resident. They need
51 to hire their own attorney.

52 Tom asked Brian if there were any other conversations with the Gordons. Brian said that the BOS has
53 worked with the Gordons to resolve a number of complaints.

54 Carol stated that in her opinion, this does not belong to the Planning Board, but to the Select Board. The
55 Planning Board is the regulator, but not the enforcer. Furthermore, the Planning Board is in no position to
56 be able to verify any of the complaints – even the ones that might relate directly to the approved plan.

57 Tom clarified that in order for the planning board to act on any complaint, it would need documentation
58 from a professional that there is in fact a violation. The Planning Board will look at our regulations to see
59 what changes are needed to meet today's needs. At this point, he does not see any action for the Board to
60 take.

61 Tom stated that the Board wanted to be ready for public hearing on the updated Regulations as soon as is
62 reasonable. He suggested that the Board look again at Section IX, and look at other town regulations. He
63 asked, how do we set the guidelines in place so that other, new board members have the information they
64 need to make good decisions. At the next meeting the Board will review the changes and set a date for
65 public hearing.

66

67 **III. Planning**

68 **a. Excavation Regulations Update Review**

69 The Board is continuing its review of the Excavation Regulations. Carol walked the Board through the few
70 changes/additions that had been made since the previous version was reviewed, most of them for better
71 clarity. The one section of substance is in Section IX, Paragraph B. which addresses standards that could
72 be applied to new or expanding pits. She explained that this is something the Regulations have not taken
73 into account, and she is still somewhat uncertain as to how far the Board can go in imposing additional
74 conditions. She looks forward to input from the Town's attorney to help sort this out.

75 Tom asked if anyone had any comments on what was being reviewed.

76 Ariene Ice referenced the City of Keene Regulation, which she said is very detailed. It is important to strike
77 a balance between the potential for damage from excavations and getting involved in homeowner civil
78 disputes. She thinks that if language to that effect gets wrapped into the ordinance, it sets the Board up to
79 having to resolve disputes. Determining impacts on wells and water quality is a hard place to be. For
80 example, water testing relies on patterns over time; the Board should think about what the limitation means
81 in terms of determining violations.

82 Bill Whyte stated that if the blasting distance from homes is 500 feet, for example, he sees problems with
83 proving that the blasting caused the problem. It would have to go to court. Future regulation could set
84 further distance from wells.

85 Tom advised the Board to look at RSA 674:51, which was cited in the email from NHMA, which addresses
86 how a town can adopt codes dealing with blasting.

87

88 **IV. Informational**

89 a. Inquiry regarding zoning and permitted uses for 73 Alstead Hill Road

90 Board Review: The property is in the Rural Residential District, which does not permit business uses. The
91 previous business use was non-conforming. If the intent is to have a business there, they would need to
92 demonstrate that the use was in operation less than a year ago, otherwise a variance would be needed.

93 b. Correspondence from the Gallaghers

94 The Gallaghers are asking what they need to do to replace their home that needs to be demolished. The
95 answer is that, as the house is non-conforming, it would need to be replaced in exactly the same location
96 within a year. Otherwise, a variance from the ZBA would be required. Heidi will follow up with them.

97 c. The 2025-2026 NH Planning and Land use Regulation is now available. There are copies
98 in the library.

99 d. C-PACER Myth-Busting for NH Municipalities. Free Webinar April 23rd from 1:00 to 2:00
100 P.M.

101 **Event Description:**

102 Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) is a financing tool that helps
103 commercial properties invest in energy efficiency, renewable energy, water conservation, and property
104 resiliency improvements. As more local officials and residents prepare to vote on enabling C-PACER
105 within their communities (as required by law), local leaders are asking good questions about the
106 municipal roles, administrative tasks, and risk protection factors associated with C-PACER.
107

108 e. Next Citizen Planner Roundtable in Walpole in June, details TBA

109

110 **V. Next Meeting – April 22, 2026 – Draft Agenda Items**

111 a. Minutes of March 25, 2026

112 b. Review Third Draft of Excavation Regulations

113 c. Review of Site Plan Review application fee

114 d. Master Planning

115 e. Short-Term Rental Ordinance

116 *On a motion by Brian Bazarnicki/seconded by Heidi Bukoski, the Board voted to adjourn at 8:47 P.M. with*
117 *all in favor.*

118

119 Respectfully Submitted by:

120 Carol Ogilvie

121

122 **Approved** _____, 2026

123

124

125 Kevin Barnes

126

127

128 Brian Bazarnicki

129

130

131 Heidi Bukoski

132

133

134 Tom Julius, Chair

135

136

137 Carol Ogilvie

DRAFT