



**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
Monday, November 13, 2017 7:00 PM  
Council Chambers, City Hall

**MINUTES**  
Approved 12/11/2017

**I. Roll Call**

**Present:** Marilyn Harris, Bruce Kolenda, Marlene Jordan, Richard Wahrlich, David Putnam, Allen Damren

**Absent:** Nick Koloski William Greenrose, James Short, Charlene Lovett

**City Staff:** Michael McCrory, City Planner

**II. Review of Minutes**

A. None

**III. Old Business**

**IV. New Business**

- A. **(PL 2017-00016) Jason Grady, 16 Old High Bridge Road:** Application for a site plan waiver for In the Garden Greenhouses at **16 Old High Bridge Road**. Tax Map 56, Lot 2. District RR2.

Mr. Wahrlich read the public notice.

Mr. McCrory said the applicant wants to add a food stand to the existing business. He said it might evolve into a broader food service use. Mr. McCrory said this proposal falls into a sort of grey area between agricultural use and something else. The products in the food stand might be primarily grown on the property (value-added agriculture) or imported from off-site (something else). Due to the uncertainty, Mr. McCrory had recommended site plan waiver as the best approach.

Mr. McCrory reminded the Board that the waiver calls for a yes/no vote and there are no conditions. The waiver can be granted if the Board finds that the proposal does not create a substantial change to the use of the property. The waiver can be granted administratively, but the staff prefer not to. Waiver requests will be eliminated when the site plan regulations are updated.

Mr. Grady said the greenhouses are open May and June only. Their parking lot has up to five cars at a time on days that are not Mother's Day weekend or Memorial Day weekend

– then it's 25 cars. Mr. Grady said he began expanding the vegetable gardens this summer in anticipation of this idea. The idea is to start small and see how it goes. If it goes well and expansion seems likely, he would return to the Board. People would come to a window of the house, place their order and pick it up at another window. Outdoor seating would be scattered around the yard. He indicated on an aerial photo where additional parking would be available. Outdoor bathrooms are already available. The tank for the bathrooms may have to be pumped more often because it is almost filling now with the existing customer traffic.

Mr. Grady said he is considering painting parking spaces and making a traffic loop to improve traffic flow.

Mr. Grady said he would launch this idea next April when the greenhouses open again. He envisions four crockpots, four types of meat (to create 12 different burritos, tacos and sandwiches), vegetable sides, ice cream, and drinks.

The question was raised as to how big the operation could become before site plan review would be necessary. Mr. Grady said the existing residential kitchen that they will use will limit the size of the operation. If he wanted to expand, he would have to move the operation and then would have to come back to the Board.

There will not be any seating in the house. The food will be mostly pre-prepared. It will not be a restaurant at this stage.

Mr. Grady will create a path to the windows of the house. Trashcans will be provided near the outdoor seating.

The greenhouses open April 20<sup>th</sup> and close July 4<sup>th</sup>. They re-open Labor Day for mums. He would like to have both businesses open late April to Halloween. However, he is exploring the idea of being open year-round instead of seasonal.

Mr. Damren agreed with Mr. Putnam's question – what would be the trigger to requiring site plan review? Mr. Grady said he would likely be the one to seek the review when/if he outgrows the current proposal.

A food service license will be required. It is unclear if a certificate of occupancy would be required or granted. Mr. McCrory said in some regards this appears to be an inconsequential expansion of an existing use.

Mr. McCrory said the evidence he is looking at included:

- It will be a walk-up window service.
- It will be seasonal.
- It will be an add-on to the nursery service and only active when the nursery is active.
- If it turns out that the snack bar generates more traffic than the nursery, Mr. McCrory does not see that as a substantial consequence to the new use.

- Once the snack bar moves to seated service in the barn, the “wire is tripped” for Mr. McCrory.

Mr. Putnam said that if the Board grants the waiver, “then with a lack of a site plan review, where it’s read into the record, with possible conditions, for instance defining what ‘seasonal’ means, then we have no jurisdiction over what any applicant does in having an opportunity like this with their property. I think about how we set ourselves up in following through with in all regulations, codes and policies that we’ve approved. I wanted to have that discussion so we understand what we’re doing here.”

Mr. McCrory said the principal characteristics in this case are “seasonal” and “walk-up window service”. This was the substance of the proposal for the waiver. This is the limit Mr. McCrory would be comfortable with in any future tests rather than trying to impose conditions on what should be an up/down vote.

Mr. Putnam asked that the minutes reflect this conversation. (Yes, I was listening...)

Mr. McCrory read the abutters list.

Mr. Wahrlich opened the public forum and asked if anyone wished to speak. No one did. Mr. Wahrlich closed the public forum.

**Motion:** To grant the waiver requested for a seasonal snack bar at the property of the In the Garden greenhouses.

**Made by:** Mr. Putnam      **Second:** Mr. Kolenda

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

Ms. Harris asked how the Board would know if the project would be conducted as it had been presented. Mr. McCrory said if it appears that the use has exceeded what was presented, he would have to do a site visit.

### **Conceptual Review of a Residential Development Proposal – Mark Limoges**

Mr. McCrory said Mr. Lemieux has spoken to City staff about the proposal. A permitting process has been developed for the project. A variance from the density requirements will be required (this would be applied for before coming to the Planning Board). This is a non-binding discussion designed to provide feedback.

Mr. Limoges said he would like to put in three sets of duplexes on the 1-acre parcel on Veterans Park Road (parcel 96-87-1). He said he is missing enough land for the three duplexes (there is enough for two, but they need three to make it work). Mr. Limoges has contacted the owner of the lot on the corner of Winter and Veterans Park (96-88) to buy the lot. If he is able to buy the lot, the variance wouldn’t be necessary.

The boundary lines of parcels 96-87 and 96-87-1 will be re-arranged somewhat to accommodate the proposal.

Mr. Putnam suggested moving units 1 and 2 to the other side of the new driveway. He also said he would like to see the project stay within the existing boundaries of the lots.

Each unit will have 3 bedrooms and around 1600 square feet.

Mr. Kolenda said landscaping would be an issue.

Mr. Wahrlich said snow removal/snow storage and trash storage/removal are issues the Planning Board usually examines.

Mr. Limoges said the utilities would be underground (electrical) and hidden (propane). The driveway would be paved and lit. There will be upshot lighting on some of the landscaping.

Mr. Putnam urged Mr. Limoges to work with the Planning Office to design the project so as to avoid needing a variance.

Mr. Damren said storm water and runoff will need to be addressed. He also said he wanted to see the lot lines of parcel 96-87 squared up.

Mr. Kolenda said that the bright lights from the park next door might be a problem for the future tenants.

Everyone agreed that this type of housing is much needed in Claremont.

The Board thanked Mr. Limoges for coming to the Board so early in the process.

The Board returned to the work session to finish the discussion on the *Housing* chapter.

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

Mr. Putnam invited the Planning Board to attend the last meeting of the Master Plan Steering Committee on November 21<sup>st</sup>. He felt the Planning Board should thank the Steering Committee for the hard work they have done.

There will be one more chapter for the Plan – the *Implementation* chapter.

## **VI. Other**

The NHMA conference is this week.

Meeting schedule – the next meeting is the Monday after Thanksgiving; then the second Monday in December; then the Wednesday after Christmas.

The final draft of the Master Plan will be handed out in early December. This will start the 30-day public review period so the Plan can be adopted in January. Mr. McCrory said he wanted to hold meetings on each of these dates, even if there are no applications, so the work sessions can continue.

**VII. Correspondence**

**VIII. Adjournment**

**Motion:** To adjourn the meeting

Made by: Mr. Kolenda      Second: Ms. Jordan

Vote: Unanimous in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:34 PM.

**Respectfully submitted,**  
*deForest Bearse*