



**Planning Board Meeting**  
Monday, February 9, 2009  
Council Chambers, City Hall at 7:00 pm

**Meeting Minutes**  
*Approved 2/23/09*

**Meeting Called to order by Planning Board Chair Peter Guillette at 7:01 pm**

**I. Roll Call**

**Present:** Richard Wahrlich, Alan Grigsby, Deborah Cutts, Paul LaCasse, Peter Guillette, Lori Richardson  
Brian Rapp, Adam Burke, Erwin Caplan

**Absent:** None

**City Staff:** Peter Dzewaltowski, Interim City Planner; Ed Tinker, Director of Planning & Development;  
Michelle Aiken, Boards & Commissions Coordinator

**II. Review of Minutes**

- Monday, January 12, 2009 public meeting minutes

**Motion to:** Approve the January 12, 2009 meeting minutes.

**Made by:** Mr. Grigsby

**Second by:** Ms. Richardson

**Vote:** Unanimous

**III. Draft Ordinance 504 Infill and Inclusionary Development – Informational/Discussion**

Chair Guillette advised there will be a public hearing at the next scheduled meeting. Mr. Dzewaltowski described the proposed draft ordinance. On this Wednesday the 11<sup>th</sup> the City Council will have a formal presentation and he encouraged the board to attend that City Council meeting and participate in that discussion. Mr. Dzewaltowski advised the purpose and intent of the ordinance is geared towards investment and development within the City center on particular parcels that are served by city sewer systems in Claremont. We have excess water and sewer capacity within the city's treatment plants. We have the potential for a number of users to add onto the system which will distribute fixed cost and reduce the rates. By doing this we encourage development in the city center, which helps improve the existing housing stock and provide additional housing options. The basis is found in the most recent update to the land use section of the master plan. Mr. Dzewaltowski described the requirements to be eligible for this type of development. This ordinance is strictly for residential development and districts. These are for vacant parcels or if a building was removed and the parcel redeveloped. It is bringing the development standards in line with the existing development and settlement pattern within the city. There are size thresholds depending on the district division. The main purpose of the ordinance is that it needs to be served at the time of development by the existing sewer and water systems without having to extend the public elements of that structure.

There are about 20 or so vacant lots within the service area that ranges from small lots to larger 8-10 acres. Mr. Dzewaltowski advised he could point out some of the specific areas at the next meeting. Ms. Richardson asked if they were certain parcels they were thinking of? City or private owned. Mr. LaCasse asked what the sizes of the water pipes feeding the area are. Mr. Dzewaltowski advised this is something that will be looked at with each individual development & that the intent is to spur private development, not to have the city act as developer. Chair Guillette asked what percentage is the water and sewer capacity running at. Mr. Tinker

advised it's about 25-40% of capacity. Mr. Dzewartowski explained the incentives and density requirements, which included the preservation of open space and parking requirements.

Mr. Grigsby asked if there is anything pending that would make this ordinance need to be passed right away. Mr. Dzewartowski advised he did not know of any. Mr. Grigsby asked why the PRD is being removed. Mr. Dzewartowski advised this ordinance was designed to have two purposes, as they move through the process they found that they were able to better suit the open space by encouraging development in the core of the city and that the planned residential development part would be addressed in a subsequent cluster ordinance. Mr. Grigsby felt it was not necessary to delete the PRD. Mr. Dzewartowski thought there is a possibility of conflict within the two ordinances. Mr. Grigsby asked why there is no ZBA review. Mr. Dzewartowski advised there is no ZBA review unless there are 2 zoning districts within one parcel and it was found that there didn't need to be the additional review of the ZBA in any other circumstances. Site plan and subdivision review should encompass all the review that is needed and the addition of the ZBA would be burdensome to an applicant.

Mr. Grigsby went through sections he had questions on such as the part that advises no existing structure will be removed as part of the development plan. Mr. Dzewartowski advised that this means that historic structures would not be eligible; we do not want to encourage historic structures to be taken down. Mr. Grigsby felt that needed to be re-written and clarified because it says that it may be taken down. Mr. Grigsby asked why it is a 10 acre limit. Mr. Dzewartowski advised it was determined by the parcel in the service areas. Mr. Grigsby asked a question regarding the petroleum products and natural features. He asked why just petroleum and why not minerals. Mr. Dzewartowski advised it is not the intent to get credit for that type of natural features. Mr. Grigsby noted that the section 22-575 first paragraph last sentence advises the min lot size are not mandated. Mr. Dzewartowski will look at that, they either can be or cannot be smaller. Mr. Grigsby advised he does like the sections requesting a narrative and a performance bond. Mr. Grigsby feels that having the ZBA involved is necessary. Mr. Dzewartowski advised we are trying to encourage investment within this infrastructure and by having adequate review at the Planning Board level we do not need to have additional process by the ZBA.

Mr. Dzewartowski advised there were a number of different things the City could do and if they wanted to have a special exception required you could suggest that, but staff did not feel that was necessary. Mr. Grigsby asked about the parking design requirements, would the Planning Board be able to have flexibility. Mr. Dzewartowski advised this is a way to relate site plan review and you may be surprised what you are able to accommodate parking, building and landscaping in a 5,000 sqft lot. It is impossible to plan for every circumstance. Mr. Grigsby asked if the Planning Board can decide not to have bonuses if they don't feel they are appropriate. Mr. Dzewartowski advised it is worded so the Planning Board may award density bonuses based on criteria. Mr. Wahrlich asked about the density bonus. Mr. Dzewartowski advised this is in addition to your units per acre standard and you would need to demonstrate that you have met the criteria for the bonus. Mr. LaCasse felt that 18 units per acre (higher density areas) is way too many units, for safety reasons and he feels that they have been trying to make this requirement bigger and he wants to open up the space. Mr. Dzewartowski advised that the people of Claremont have advised they want to maintain the environment they have. Mr. LaCasse advised he doesn't wish to maintain the environment we have. Chair Guillette asked Mr. Dzewartowski to come back in 2 weeks with the corrections and the board can discuss it some more. Ms. Cutts advised she is also concerned with what the layout would be and she would like some pictures of what you may be looking at when you have 18 units on 1 acre, where they might park their cars, where there garage would be, etc. It doesn't matter if those pictures are in Claremont. If there are areas in Claremont that are pleasing that will show what they are proposing, she would like to see what the end product would look like. Mr. Dzewartowski advised that when talking about the existing environment and replicating that he knows that there have been some concerns about certain regulations and these are things that have been given some serious consideration as the process was developed. Ms. Cutts advised that what you do have is a plan that needs to be tweaked but this has a lot of strategic planning behind it and that is good. Mr. Grigsby advised his major concern is the PRD removal, he doesn't feel removing this is necessary. He would like to keep it in place just in case the open space ordinance

never sees the light of day. Mr. Dzewaltowski advised that they would look into the rational of why that was removed and get back to him.

Chair Guillette encourages everyone to attend the City Council Meeting. There will be a public hearing at the next Planning Board meeting on February 23<sup>rd</sup>.

#### **IV. Other**

Mr. Folta advised he felt that Citizen Input should be on the agenda.

#### **V. Reports from Boards and Commissions**

- Appointments to other boards and commissions

Mr. Guillette advised he attend the Technical Review. Mr. Rapp would like to be on the Historic District Commission. Mr. Burke will continue on the Conservation Commission. Mr. Guillette would like to remind the public that there are open seats on the Planning Board and he would encourage people to apply for those seats.

#### **VI. Adjournment**

**Motion to:** Adjourn

**Made by:** Mr. Burke

**Second:** Mr. LaCasse

**Vote:** Unanimous

Meeting Adjourned at: 8:15 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Aiken

Boards & Commissions Coordinator