



Planning Board Meeting
Monday, May 24, 2010
Council Chambers, City Hall at 7:00 pm

Meeting Minutes
Approved June 14, 2010

I. Roll Call

Present: Peter Guillette, Amanda Silvers, Bruce Kolenda, Erwin Caplan, Adam Burke, Richard Wahrlich

Absent: Brian Rapp, Lori Richardson, Deborah Cutts, Catherine MacKenzie

City Staff: Mike McCrory, Interim City Planner; Jane Taylor, City Solicitor, Kelly LeBlanc, Administrative Assistant

Alternate Bruce Kolenda was asked to join the hearing for purposes of quorum

II. Review of Meeting Minutes from March 22, 2010 & May 10, 2010

Motion to: Move meeting minutes from March 22, 2010 and May 10, 2010 to next Planning Board meeting on June 14, 2010.

Made By: Adam Burke **second:** Amanda Silvers **Vote:** unanimous

III. New Business

(2010-0007) BIS REALTY – 21 Grissom Lane –Applicant seeks site plan approval for the Bourdon’s Storage Lot at 21 Grissom Lane. The proposal is to construct a 190’ x 200’ gravel parking area for the storage of box trailers. Property Location: **21 Grissom Lane, Claremont 03743**. Tax Map 176-6; Zone I-3.

Project Description

The applicant proposes to construct a parking area on Lot 2 of a recently approved, subdivided lot along Grissom Lane. The Applicant will re-grade an existing gravel stockpile on the 12.72-acre parcel to establish the parking area. The purpose of the parking area is to store up to 36 box trailers per the plan submitted in the application. These trailers will act as short-term storage units for mattresses in preparation for periods of peak demand.

I. Primary Planning Considerations

This application is for Site Plan Review. The proposed use is permitted in the Zoning Ordinance and the Applicant has obtained all necessary municipal permits in order to proceed with an application for Site Plan Review.

Site Plan Submission Requirements: The plans accurately represent the proposed use as described during a number of meetings between the Applicant and City Staff,

including attendance at a Technical Review Committee meeting. The following bullets summarize certain aspects of the proposal:

- The proposed use Site Plan will utilize an existing curb cut onto Grissom Lane. The design of the access that Lots 1 and 2 will share appears to adequately address the safe truck movements to and from Lot 2.
- Trucks will deliver and remove box trailers as necessary. This proposed use will not be a high-traffic generator. The estimated daily traffic demand for the site may more accurately be measured in truck trips per week, rather than trips per day or hour.
- The site will have no lighting. There will be a security gate to manage vehicle access to and from the site.
- There will be provisions for stormwater management on-site. The limited extent of disturbance from this proposal will not result in a significant increase in stormwater run-off.
- The character of the neighboring properties, generally residential, agricultural, and light industrial uses. The proposal includes planting vegetation between the proposed use and the residence located east of the site to minimize any visual impact. The proposed use will have limited daily activity on the site and will not have an undue negative impact on surrounding residential uses.
- No permanent buildings are proposed on-site.

II. Standard Conditions

Conditions Precedent

1. The applicant shall obtain and receive approval for all necessary permits as determined by the City of Claremont Public Works Department.
2. The applicant shall obtain and receive approval for all necessary permits as determined by the State of New Hampshire.

Conditions Subsequent

1. The applicant shall obtain and receive approval for all necessary permits as determined by the City of Claremont Building Inspector.
2. The applicant shall notify the Zoning Administrator and Building Inspector when the project construction is complete. Completion of the project shall be in substantial compliance with the plans submitted for review and all conditions of approval.
3. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy all required improvements shall be completed in place unless the Applicant provides the city security for the completion of said improvements, in accordance with Article XI of the City of Claremont Site Plan Regulations.
4. The Site Plan is valid for three (3) years from the date of approval. If a building permit has not been issued before the three-year deadline, the site plan is no longer valid and must be recertified through the Planning Board.

III. Site Specific Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall maintain the site according to best management practices for per conditions of approval by this Planning Board and other municipal, state and federal permits, as well as applicable state and federal regulations.

****No buildings proposed on site****

Ms. Silvers inquired if the radius of the driveway would allow trucks to make a right and left hand turn onto Grissom Lane.

Mr. McCrory clarified that the modified location is not the Grissom Lane entrance but where the driveway branches off leading to the residential lot.

Motion to: Accept application as complete

Made by: Adam Burke **Second by:** Amanda Silvers **Vote:** Unanimous

Charles Aiken, BIS Realty
Randy Rhoades – M & W soils engineering
Wayne McCutcheon – Surveyor

Mr. Rhoades stated that the majority of the gravel being used for this project is already on the site. The driveway has been roughed in and therefore additional work may not needed for completion of the driveway/roadway. A stock pile of crushed rock is currently located at the top of the hill. The ditch and detention area have also been roughed out. A final cleaning will be necessary.

Mr. Burke inquired if there will need to be any screening to block the view of the trailers from the house and also if the trailers be visible from the road.

Mr. Rhoades stated no, one pine tree might be needed for complete screening but the area is already heavily vegetated. Trailers are not visible form Route 12.

Chair Guillette inquired about erosion control measures and if the drainage the only piece that would be affected due to the road.

Mr. Rhoades stated that the contractor would have to take into account standard temporary erosion control. Current there are no drainage/water problems. DPW sought confirmation that any water coming from the area would not make it to the street.

Open Public Hearing

No abutters Present

Close Public Hearing

Mr. Kolenda asked if Lot 1, because it was designated as residential, has any foreseeable problems. Could the residents of Lot 1 freely vacate that lot without conflict if the property is sold?

Mr. Aiken confirmed shared access onto Grissom lane. There will be a maximum of 3 trailer trips a day (M-F) during normal working hours. Currently there is no foreseeable problem. At no time will trailers be left in the driveway thus assuring that the residence will have continuous full access of the driveway.

Motion to: Approve site plan application for BIS Realty including the Conditions Subsequent, Conditions Precedent and Site Specific Conditions.

Made by: Adam Burke **Second by:** Bruce Kolenda **Vote:** Unanimous

IV. Reports from Boards and Commissions

V. Other

- **Discussion of Master Plan Economic Development Chapter**

The City is looking to update the current version of the MP to 2010. Every couple of months a new Chapter will be presented to the Planning Board for review. Comments and questions from the PB will be added and/or addressed.

Chair Guillette read the goals and objectives of the MP Economic Development Chapter for the benefit of the television audience.

Mr. Burke inquired if under Section 2.3 Major Employers; Table 2-1 (Major Employers) Lowes could be added to the list of employers.

Mr. McCrory stated that Lowes can be added and might have not been added due to a timing issue when compiled

Mr. Burke asked how the Master Plan was initially presented as he was not present for the initial meeting. Mr. McCrory stated that the chapter was given to members/mailed. No formal presentation of the chapter.

Mr. Burke suggested that a PowerPoint presentation might be useful as an aid for the television audience as it will project a summary of the information received by the board. Chair Guillette stated that the visual presentation will get the information out and attract public interest. Then in a public hearing the public will come in with correct information and not hearsay.

Mr. Burke reinforced the significance of depicting the Goals and Objectives for the public to have a visual along with hearing the discussion during Planning Board meeting. Chair Guillette followed up by stating the PowerPoint on the screen will allow for the public to draw their own conclusions based on the data presented.

Ms. Silvers inquired if there is a list of the companies that have shut down or relocated recently. This might be beneficial to show.

Mr. McCrory stated that there is currently no list of this nature. The identification of major employers versus how it compares with populations might present a useful time line analysis. Chair Guillette presented that a list of businesses that have recently moved into Claremont would be beneficial.

Use charts/tables to show the dichotomy of business entering and leaving Claremont.

Mr. Burke asked if there was any thought on an Economic Retention section.

Mr. McCrory stated retention and expansion is the first goal.

Mr. McCrory will give a brief presentation focusing on the purpose of the MP. There are no specifics in the MP in terms of 'we will do this by this date.' It is a broad, guiding document. The MP is a broad plan of the City's development over the next 10-15 years. The MP identifies goals that the City feels reasonable and attainable in the scope of the MP; a 5-10-15 year span. The MP develops policies, at the municipal level, to promote and adopt this goal.

This is a reason why the state statute recommends every 5-10 years each municipality may update their MP. Changing opinion or direction makes updates necessary.

How the city executes the goals of the MP is the decision of the City Manager and City Council with the guidance of the Planning and Development Department.

Chair Guillette commented that often business members would not know what is available to them, when it is available, financing options and the like. The Planning and Development Office is able to assist the new business through the process of planning and building codes. Mr. Burke asked if this is a reach-out program. Is the City going out to the businesses stating this is what is available or do we wait for them to come to us asking for help.

Mr. McCrory stated that from a business development aspect we have minimally two very dedicated staff working with incoming business. Ongoing Outreach could be discussed and/or addressed.

At the next Planning Board meeting the discussion will continue to members who were not present the opportunity to state their opinions and ask questions.

The MP Housing Chapter will be next on the list for presentation to the PB.

- **Revise and Update Chapter 22, Division 14, Historic District – Discussion & Recommendation**

Jane Taylor and Nancy Merrill discussed concerns regarding the ordinance pertaining only to the Historic District and not the entire City of Claremont.

The genesis of the revision to the Historic District Ordinance was to address the difficulty in attaining a quorum of the HDC. The way the Ordinance was written it had the largest quorum requirements in the state. Most of the existing Ordinance was written before the applicable state laws were written. Some of the language and requirements were different and therefore the entirety of the Ordinance was assessed. The main change was to the quorum requirement.

Chair Guillette confirmed that the spirit of the HDC is not changing. Ms. Taylor confirmed that this is correct. Going through the ordinance allowed revisions to follow state law but does not change the spirit.

The significant changes you would find in the revision to sec 22-403 documents organization. This organization would change the current quorum of 5 to 3 members for a voting quorum.

An additional issue is time constraints in the existing Ordinance but not in state law. The notice requirements at the local level must not be shorter than the time allowed. Currently set at 45 days. The current state law assures 45 days to issue a decision not notice provisions, which is what Claremont is current using. The HDC is a type of Zoning Board. The proposed changes make the HDC under the same regulations of the Zoning Board.

The goal is to have the first reading of this Ordinance at the June 9th Council meeting. It will then come back before the June 14th Planning Board meeting. The second reading will occur on July 14th if the first is approved.

Chair Guillette asked the final date for a recommendation from the Planning Board.

At the next meeting the PB will address writing a letter and whether or not to support the Ordinance.

Ms. Taylor clarified that if a recommendation is made the PB will need to make their recommendation before the final council meeting.

Chair Guillette recommends moving this agenda item to the next meeting to have a discussion including the members who were unable to attend tonight's meeting.

VI. Correspondence

DES – Structural / Canem Steel - Alteration of Terrain Permit notification to Planning Board and Conservation Commission. Comments needed by June 1, 2010.

VII. Adjournment

Motion: to adjourn

Made By: Adam Burke **Second:** Amanda Silvers **Vote:** Unanimous

Adjourned at 7:50PM

Respectfully Submitted by

Kelly LeBlanc, Administrative Assistant