



Planning Board Meeting
Monday, December 23, 2013
Council Chambers, City Hall at 7:00 pm

Minutes
Approved January 27, 2014

I. Roll Call

Present: Richard Wahrlich, Rusty Fowler, William Greenrose, Bruce Kolenda, James Short (open seat)

Absent: Peter Guillette, James Neilsen IV, Victor Bergeron

City Staff: Michael McCrory, Interim City Planner; Danielle Coolidge, Minute Taker

Bruce Kolenda will sit in as chair and James Short will sit for an alternate seat.

II. Review of Minutes November 25, 2013

Motion: to approve minutes from November 25, 2013 with the following amendments: note that Mr. Short addressed the issue of snow removal at the proposed Dunkin' Donuts location.

Made By: Mr. Greenrose **Second:** Mr. Short **Vote:** Unanimous

III. Old Business

- **Zoning Updates** - Review of corrections to the recently adopted City Center Project zoning amendments.
- **Draft Site Plan Regulations** - Discussion of draft amendments to the Site Plan Regulations.

Mr. McCrory stated that the City Solicitor has not reviewed the proposed zoning amendments to this date; however, she will be reviewing them in the near future. He also stated that members of the community can receive a copy of the drafted zoning amendments at the city's Planning and Development office. The term "abandoned" will be added referring to the discontinued continuous use of a structure for at least twelve (12) months.

Mr. Greenrose questioned if the twelve (12) month requirement for abandonment was a standard length of time and why this number of months was selected.

Mr. McCrory stated that most zoning ordinances use 12 – 18 months; usually 12, and that throughout Claremont's zoning literature, 12 months has been the standard.

Mr. Fowler stated that the current zoning ordinance already states the 12 month requirement. Mr. McCrory agreed with Mr. Fowler.

Mr. McCrory also stated the changes made to the term "frontage" and clarified what will be established as a house's "front," which also determines the house's side yard, backyard, etc.

Mr. Greenrose asked if these changes will affect postal addresses.

Mr. McCrory stated that all of zoning amendments only effect issues concerning zoning and will not affect street addressing.

Mr. Greenrose asked why class III roads where not included.

Mr. McCrory stated that class III roads fall into the state highway classification. Changes to home occupation approvals were also modified to include that approvals are invalid if the approved activity is substantially changed or abandoned. Definitions of light and heavy industry were also added.

Mr. Greenrose asked for clarification between the light and heavy industry definitions which Mr. McCrory provided.

Mr. Fowler asked about the rights of home owners living near a heavy industry, especially pertaining to noise nuisances.

Mr. McCrory stated that most residences in areas where heavy industry is allowed have already been converted into commercial properties. He also stated that the city would want to make reasonable effort to abate any issues arising between residences and industries. Additionally, he also stated that the zoning ordinances have several areas that address such issues and gave the example of the current separation requirement between an industry and adjacent residences.

Mr. McCrory also discussed the addition of “primary building” and “primary use” definitions. The definition of a “setback” was also modified. An additional variance requirement was added to include a time limit to approved variances.

Mr. Kolenda asked for clarification of the proposed time limit requirement which Mr. McCrory provided.

Mr. McCrory stated that the two (2) year time limit proposal was also added to special exception approvals. Nonconformances were also modified to include that modifications to lot lines shall make such lots less nonconforming. The language in Section 22-111, concerning setbacks, was modified. Manufactured housing on individual lots in the CR1 and CR2 districts was eliminated. Mr. McCrory stated that these districts are very small and that these neighborhoods have distinct historical character. He also stressed that these changes would not remove the opportunity for manufactured housing in Claremont.

Mr. Greenrose questioned the intent of eliminating manufactured housing from these districts and questioned if eliminating manufactured housing would address the intent.

Mr. McCrory stated that there is a set definition of manufactured housing and it includes housing that is built on a permanent chassis and not on a foundation. He stated that the intent is to preserve the historical character of these districts.

Mr. Greenrose clarified that modular housing is not manufactured housing.

Mr. Wahrlich stated that when the board reconstructed The Master Plan for Claremont a few years ago, it was verbally agreed that it was undesirable for manufactured housing to be placed on individual lots.

Mr. McCrory stated he reviewed The Master Plan and that it did not state the intent for how manufactured housing should be treated in Claremont.

Mr. McCrory stated that in the PR and MU zones, mixed use would also include “residential use in upper stories.” The granting criteria for accessory dwelling units were also modified to remove redundancies and improve the current language. Section 22-389, Table of Dimensional Regulations, a column for lot frontage requirements is added. It is also proposed that the mixed use zone would be exempt from the Urban Exemption to the Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act. Mr. McCrory further explained this act and the impact such exemptions would have in Claremont.

Mr. Kolenda asked if a business was destroyed that was closely bordering the shoreline, if they would be able to rebuild in the same location. Mr. McCrory stated that with the proposed exemption they would be allowed to rebuild in the same footprint.

Parking lot design provisions were also modified and a minimum aisle width was added.

Mr. Fowler asked for clarification on aisle width.

Alternative parking designs were discussed which concluded the proposed zoning changes.

Mr. McCrory again encouraged the public to submit any concerns or questions regarding the proposed zoning amendments to the Planning and Development office.

IV. New Business

V. Reports from Boards and Commissions

VI. Other

VII. Correspondence

VIII. Adjournment

Motion: to Adjourn

Made By: Mr. Greenrose

Second: Mr. Short

Vote: Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 8:01 PM

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Danielle Coolidge