



Planning Board Meeting
Monday, November 23, 2015
Council Chambers, City Hall at 7:00 PM

MINUTES
Approved 12/14/2015

Mr. Wahrlich called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

I. Roll Call

Present: Jim Neilsen, David Putnam, James Short, Victor Bergeron, Bruce Kolenda, Neil Ward, William Greenrose, Chris Belvin, Richard Wahrlich

Absent: Marilyn Harris

City Staff: Michael McCrory, Interim City Planner

II. Review of Minutes – November 9, 2015

Motion: To accept the minutes of November 9, 2015 as written.

Made by: Mr. Short **Second:** Mr. Greenrose

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

IV. New Business

- a. **PL 2015-00014 New Hampshire Industries, 68 Etna Road, Lebanon, NH:**
Application for site plan amendment for establishment of manufacturing and office space in the existing building at **35 Connecticut River Bend Road**. Tax Map 186, Lot 2. Zone: I1.

Mr. Wahrlich read the public notice. Mr. McCrory asked that the address be changed to read “35 Connecticut River Bend Place”.

Staff Report

Mr. McCrory stated that the Ice River building was built but never occupied. New Hampshire Industries (NHI) is looking to occupy the building and use it to manufacture pulleys and precision machine parts. They will occupy the building as it stands now (Phase I according to the plans).

City Staff felt that this is enough of a change in use to warrant the Board’s review (in addition to the fact that the building has been vacant for quite awhile).

The original use was granted site plan approval in 2007 and while much of the site work has been completed there are some issues that need to be addressed. They include a cul-de-sac; lighting and landscaping; and site parking and employment.

The cul-de-sac was never constructed and the current proposal does not include it. The cul-de-sac has been discussed and viewed at site visits by City staff, the applicant, DPW and the Fire Department. Connecticut River Bend Place is currently a private road. The Fire Chief has stated that the cul-de-sac is not necessary at this time. The DPW did not look at the road for their maintenance needs, because it is a private road. There was discussion regarding consequences of the road becoming a City road, but Mr. McCrory stated that this is something to be left to City Council to determine. It is not part of this application.

The 2007 approval included lighting and landscaping for the exterior of the building. These have not yet been installed. This has been discussed with the applicant's agent. Mr. McCrory stated that these conditions still stand. There may be changes proposed by the applicant, e.g. due to new technology that would yield the same result. The staff would like to be able to review any changes to determine if there is substantial difference. That would be a condition of approval for this current review.

The current application proposes 50 employees and 75 parking spaces. This is consistent with an industrial/manufacturing use. There may be up to 70 employees, which exceeds the current available parking, but staff does not see this as a critical issue, because the applicant proposes to convert excess paved loading areas to additional parking spaces. Mr. McCrory asked the Board to waive the parking requirements (for the additional 20 employees) and give City Staff the latitude to address it with the applicant as needed.

There are no substantial changes to the exterior of the building or the site except the addition of paving to provide a continuous loop around the building and placement of waste materials storage containers.

There are facilities on site that were permitted through alteration of terrain permits from the Department of Environmental Services. Those permits remain in place. The applicant must maintain them.

Water supplies and wastewater disposal are being addressed at the staff level, as well as building code and fire safety.

Mr. Short said the Board should vote on the waiver of the parking and lighting so the City has latitude to address them as needed.

Mr. Greenrose asked if anyone is asking the City to take the road over. Further, if the City did take over the road and there was expansion, would the facilities be adequate for fire and other emergency activities.

Mr. McCrory said he wasn't aware of any desire for the City to take it over, but were that to happen, it would be up to Council to make those determinations.

Mr. Wahrlich asked about the original intent of the cul-de-sac. Mr. McCrory said it was to serve eight lots in the original industrial subdivision. Those lots have since

been merged and the right-of-way transferred to Ice River Springs. Staff feels that the cul-de-sac is not necessary.

Mr. Greenrose asked if the additional proposed pavement would have any impact on the drainage facilities. Mr. McCrory deferred to the applicant's agent.

Mr. McCrory deemed the application complete.

Motion: To accept the application as complete.

Made by: Mr. Short **Second:** Mr. Bergeron

Vote: Unanimous in favor.

Applicant's Agent Presentation

Jeff Goodrich of Pathways Consulting presented the application. He said NHI is in a "due diligence" phase. They are here to see if the project is approvable with the proposed change in use and other issues that are on site.

Mr. Goodrich stated that sheet one of the site plan shows the basic layout of the property. Sheet two shows more detail including the existing parking and future parking shown as a grey area on the plan. They are proposing to remove the cul-de-sac for the purpose of this application and in the context of a private road; the addition of a small connector space to accommodate a plow to turn around; adding a paved area in the back to accommodate truck circulation. NHI would like to convert some of the loading bay area to a parking area. NHI maintains covered receptacles that are essentially dumpsters to store turnings and scrap steel (which must be managed and regulated). They would like to place these receptacles in a covered area on the northeast side of the building.

The applicant will be looking at all of the permits that have been granted for this project; determining the extent of compliance; and facilitating compliance where needed.

The exterior lighting is not as was approved. NHI would like to work with staff to determine if the approved lighting is the best for the site and then work to comply with the intent of the original plan.

Mr. Short asked about the type of machinery that would be used. John Batten of NHI said they currently use turning centers, automated assembly equipment; do some welding - nothing disruptive or audible outside the building.

Mr. Putnam asked the applicant to use lighting that doesn't spill into the dark. Mr. Goodrich said that was one of the changes the applicant would like to work on with staff (metal halide vs LED).

Mr. Short asked about snow removal. Mr. Goodrich said it would be pushed over the bank toward the detention areas.

Phase Two as shown on the plan is from the previous approval – it is not necessarily the vision of NHI.

Mr. Short asked about truck traffic. Mr. Batten said NHI has five common carrier trucks that come in once a day. Employee traffic is 30-40 vehicles in the morning and again at second shift.

Public Hearing

Mr. Wahrlich opened the public hearing. The abutters roll was read. Mr. Wahrlich asked for comments from abutters or anyone in the audience who wished to speak. Richard Bascom came to the podium. He said he is part owner of Davis Frame Company; he and his father-in-law were the original owners of the property. He said he hoped that the Board would approve the application. He said his only concern was the cul-de-sac. He said he would be petitioning Council to take over the common portion of the road. If DPW determines that they will need some additional space for turning plow trucks around, he suggested that the Board make construction of the turnaround a condition of approval of this application.

Mayor Neilsen said that asking the applicant to construct the turnaround or bring the road up to City standards when it is not yet necessary (based on DPW and City staff opinions) is asking too much of the applicant at this time.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Wahrlich asked if there were any more comments from the audience. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. McCrory said accommodation for all municipal vehicles to turnaround (as opposed to constructing an actual cul-de-sac) could be addressed when the need arises, perhaps at transfer of ownership. At present there is sufficient room for emergency vehicles to turn around. Mr. Bergeron said he opposed holding up this application for something that may happen in the future.

Motion: To waive the parking requirements for this application.

Made by: Mr. Short **Second:** Mr. Bergeron

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Motion: To grant a waiver for staff to work with the applicant to develop lighting that is either appropriate to the current plan or if there is something that better facilitates, that they be given the latitude to work with the applicant to create appropriate lighting.

Made by: Mayor Neilsen **Second:** Mr. Greenrose

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Motion: To approve the application with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits as determined by the Local, State, and Federal governments and maintain the site in compliance with these permits.

2. The applicant shall complete installation of the site landscaping and lighting plans in accordance with the 2007 approved Site Plan. Any modification to these approved plans shall be approved by the Planning and Development Department prior to commencement of construction activities. If Planning and Development Department staff determine the changes are substantial and warrant Planning Board review, then the applicant shall submit for Site Plan Amendment.
3. Any substantial expansion to the building or site operations, as determined by the Planning and Development Department, shall be subject to Site Plan Amendment. This includes, but is not limited to, the Phase 2 building expansion.
4. Connecticut River Bend Place, a private road accessing this property, shall be maintained by its owner or the applicant in a manner sufficient to allow City vehicles reasonable access to respond to emergencies at all times of the year.
5. The applicant shall obtain and receive approval for all necessary permits as determined by the City of Claremont Planning and Development Department. All building permits applied for from the Planning and Development Department will be reviewed under the Building/Fire Codes in place at time of application regardless of the date of this approval.
6. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the owner/applicant shall notify the Zoning Administrator and Building Inspector that the project is ready for final inspection. Completion of the project shall be in substantial compliance with the plans submitted for review and all conditions of approval.
7. Site Plans are valid for two (2) years from the date of approval. If a certificate of occupancy has not been issued before the two-year deadline, the site plan is no longer valid and must be recertified through the Planning Board.
8. Two (2) mylars of the final approved Site Plan that represents existing site conditions, in a form suitable for recording at the Sullivan County Registry of Deeds, shall be provided to the Claremont Planning and Development Department.

Made by: Mr. Greenrose **Second:** Mr. Short

Vote: Unanimous in favor

V. Reports from Boards and Commissions

Mr. Bergeron said he had attended the NH Municipal Association's two-day conference. One of the workshops he attended was on Planning Board Waivers vs. Variances and Special Exceptions. He brought copies of the presentation to share with the Board.

VI. Other

Mr. McCrory said he would like to work out a procedure so the Planning Board can revoke site plans if it needs to. He would like to create a process whereby the Board makes the decision as to whether or not to hold a public hearing – two-step process. The applicant and abutters could be part of that process. The Board discussed the idea. The consensus was that it was a good idea as presented.

VII. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

Made by: Mr. Short **Second:** Mayor Neilsen

Vote: Unanimous in favor

The meeting adjourned at 8:14 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

deForest Bearse

Resource Coordinator