



**City Center Project Steering Committee**  
Thursday January 3, 2013 at 5:00 p.m.  
The Visitor's Center  
14 North Street, Claremont, NH

**Minutes**  
**Approved 1.22.2013**

**I. Roll Call**

**Present:** Marty Davis, David Putnam, Victor Bergeron, Jason Farrell, Thomas Rock, Robert Tatro, James Feleen, David Messier, Gary Trottier. Kristen Kenniston, Keith Raymond, William Greenrose

**Absent:** None

**Staff:** Nancy Merrill, Jane Taylor, Katrina Spaulding

**II. Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** to approve the November 27, 2012 minutes.

**Made by:** Mr. Messier

**Second:** Mr. Rock

**Vote:** Unanimous

**Abstention:** Mr. Greenrose

**III. Old Business**

Nancy received an email from Eunice Kim of the Cecil Group addressing some of the questions and concerns from the previous meeting.

1. Should residential uses be allowed on the ground floor in the MU and How?

Ms. Taylor stated this issue does not impact structures that already are entirely residential. Staff would suggest that residential uses only be allowed on the ground floor on certain streets; this would be implemented by requiring a special use permit, thus allowing the Planning Board to review and decide on appropriateness. Special Use by the Planning Board could be "not-allowed" with specific reasons. If an applicant were to be denied, then an application for a variance would be done.

Mr. Davis said it would be a good idea to eliminate the "gateway" streets as an option. Mr. Bergeron disagreed as he felt some of the house or building on Main Street would never be commercial. If it were restricted to no residential on the ground floor, some of these building would remain vacant.

The suggestion was made to limit the residential ground floor option to the short part of Tremont Street, Opera House Square and Pleasant Street up to Glidden or Summer Street.

It was unanimously decided the special use conditions were all too vague. The standards of review should be more specific.

This option would also pertain to only mixed use structures.

The Committee didn't come to any final conclusion on what should be decided for allowing residential uses on the ground floor in the Mixed Use District.

2. There were signage concerns in the Historic District.

It is understood the City is going to address the criteria for signs City wide as opposed to just in the City Center.

3. Clarity on Buffers between residential and commercial uses in the PR:

Language has been added requiring planted buffer strips between residential and commercial uses in the PR district.

4. Gas Stations in the PR have been eliminated as a permitted use.
5. Design standards for handicapped ramps have been added in the design guidelines.
6. City Staff added language to the zoning regulations related to storage tanks in setback areas. Ms. Taylor feels there still needs to be clarification of the number of tanks and capacity. Ms. Merrill said the NFPA should cover these issues in their regulations.

Board reviewed additional modifications to the draft as follows:

Pg 5 – Distinction has been made between **home office** and **home occupation**.

Pg 9 – Remove “front porches – enclosed porches” as for second egress allows for steps or stairs – maybe use the word “egress” rather than “entrance”

Pg 17 – Ms. Taylor is going to re-write this entire section.

Pg 21 – The guidelines for “Special Use Permits” need to be less vague and hold more guidelines for the boards to follow. Standards of review are very thin on detail.

Pg 23 – Ms. Taylor stated with Non-conformances there are two issues for properties that are existing but don't meet zoning requirements. 1. Dimensional requirements are not being met, 2. The specific use of the structure is non-conforming to what is allowed. Ms. Taylor would like to change and improve on the language for the “Use of Land” and will re-write this section.

Pg 24 (2) – Mr. Feleen had some questions about the changes being made to this section. Ms. Taylor said if you want to improve or replace in the original foot print (with no expansion) there would not be an issue. Anything including a change in the original footprint would require the decision of the Zoning Board. The board is concerned about adding some language that would include buildings currently in disrepair.

Pgs 47-55 being omitted

Pg 56 – Struck entire B-1, B1.5 and added items # 15-22 in the permitted uses for the B-2

Pg 73 – A new section is being added to provide more clarity on the Table of Uses for the City Center Zoning Districts. This will help to make terms more easily understood. This is all followed by a “Use Table”

Pg 77 – specifically on accessory dwelling units, letter “h” the accessory dwelling unit shall be part of the primary structure – this cannot be freestanding or part of a garage, there cannot be a separate meter. Letter “n” there was some controversy as to whether this should be removed or not. Reads “A deed addendum with approval conditions be executed and recorded.” This could be rephrased to have the “approval” recorded.

Pg 78- Art Galleries need to be clearly defined and perhaps better suited as “Retail.” A closer look should be taken at the actual definition of “Retail”

Pg 79 – Retail and Secondhand Stores – The committee does NOT agree with the line that states “no outside display of stock-in-trade.”

-Ms. Taylor will check into the One (1) acre, requirement for Museums and Churches

Pg 83 – City Center Residential Districts there seems to be a conflict with the setback definition.

Pg 104 – Existing uses, (c) Wording needs to be re-worked for parking spaces to meet requirements of the use or new use.

Pg 111 – Updates need to be made to the Commercial Zones remove old zoning and replace with new zoning.

Pg 120 – All sign guidelines and requirements will be re-written.

A complete report with detailed design guidelines will be submitted to the Committee following the City Council meeting but before the next committee meeting.

#### **IV. Other**

The Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission will be doing further work on the transportation report. The report submitted by the Cecil Group does not completely address the issues.

The Safe Routes to Schools application is being written and the project sits with highest priority.

#### **V. Adjourn**

**Motion:** to adjourn

**Made by:** Mr. Greenrose

**Second:** Ms. Kenniston

**Vote:** Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 7:25 PM

Respectfully Submitted by, Katrina Spaulding