



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

MINUTES
Approved 2/27/2017

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

I. Roll Call

Present: Marilyn Harris, William Greenrose, Richard Wahrlich, Bruce Kolenda, James Short, David Putnam

Absent: Charlene Lovett, Victor Bergeron, Nicholas Koloski, Marlene Jordan, Rois Neil Ward, Jr

City Staff: Michael McCrory, City Planner

II. Review of Minutes – January 23, 2017

Motion: To approve the minutes as written.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

- a. **(PL 2017-00002) Thomas Bourdon, 91 Main Street, Claremont** – Application for subdivision approval for 3-lot subdivision at **91 Main Street**. Tax Map 107, Lot 25. Zoning District MU. (Cont. from 1/23/2017)

Mr. McCrory noted that neither the owner nor his representative were present at the meeting. This application was continued pending City Council resolution of the Pearl Street right-of-way. Unfortunately, the Council did not meet due to the weather so the matter has not yet been resolved. He said, in his opinion, it is a fairly straightforward process, but he could not predict what the outcome would be. He said the Board could approve the application with a condition regarding the ROW.

Mr. Wahrlich said the applicant isn't here and asked the Board to consider continuing it to their next meeting on February 27th.

Motion: To continue the hearing to the next meeting on February 27, 2017.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

IV. New Business

- a. **(PL 2017-00003) First United Methodist Church, Claremont** – Application for waiver of site plan approval to establish a church at **38 Summer Street**. Tax Map 132, Lot 9. Zoning District CR2.

Mr. Wahrlich read the public notice.

Planner's Presentation

Mr. McCrory provided the Board with an aerial photo of the subject property. He said the building has been used as a quilt shop since 2008. The Zoning Board has approved the Special Exception to allow the church use. (A church is considered an institutional use and is allowed by special exception in this zone.)

The Site has not fundamentally changed, so the applicant is requesting a waiver. As a matter of process, he defers to the Planning Board for the waiver.

Mr. McCrory wrote a zoning determination for the applicants on December 14th. A copy of the determination was given to the Board. In the 1990's, it was a 140-seat sanctuary. The current proposal is for a 30-seat sanctuary. Zoning requires eight parking space for this set-up. There are ten spaces available on the property. Roz Caplan, an adjacent property owner, has given the applicants permission to use her lot for additional parking as needed, e.g. during special events.

Mr. McCrory reminded the Board that this application will require a yes/no vote – no conditions – just “no, we want to see a site plan” or “yes, we don't think a site plan is necessary”.

Mr. Putnam said he was concerned about the letter from Roz Caplan because “it doesn't give us any parameters for time”. He wanted the amount of time that the church would be allowed to use the parking. He asked what would happen if Roz changes her mind or sells the property.

Mr. Wahrlich asked for confirmation that eight spaces are all that are required for a 30-seat sanctuary. Mr. McCrory agreed and said that technically the extra parking is not necessary or required.

Mr. Putnam asked what would happen if 50 people start attending the church. Mr. Wahrlich asked how that would affect the occupancy. Mr. McCrory said if it expands beyond 30 or if there is an issue where parking does become a problem, they would need to come back to the Planning and Development office to figure out the details.

Mr. McCrory said the parking could be secured by an easement that would remain with the property.

Mr. Wahrlich asked if the lawn could be converted to a couple more parking spaces. It wasn't clear whether there was any lawn left or not.

Mr. McCrory said this site meets the zoning requirements for parking, there is no substantial change to the site, there is additional parking available if – it meets the

requirements for this type of use in this location. They have received their zoning permit and are asking for a waiver from site plan (review). If the Board wants to see a site plan, it would have to be something recordable and it would only need to show the property boundaries as there are no changes to the site or the parking.

Mr. Putnam asked Mr. McCrory if he saw any need for the Board to review a site plan. Mr. McCrory said no.

Motion: To grant the waiver

Made by: Mr. Putnam

Second: Mr. Short

Vote: Unanimous in favor

V. Reports from Boards and Commissions

There were no reports.

VI. Other

a. Accessory Dwelling Units

Mr. McCrory said that new RSAs regarding accessory dwelling units will be going into effect on June 1st and the City zoning ordinance will need to be updated to reflect those changes. He said he will discuss with the Board at the next meeting the meaning of accessory dwelling units and follow that with the proposed zoning language. It is hoped to have the changes to the City Council by May.

b. CIP

Mr. Putnam said that the Planning Board's recommendation to the City Council was to "embrace and endorse the CIP plan, but it was a visionary document from the Planning Board's perspective." He said the Board should retain that perspective – that it visionary and not a financial request. He said otherwise it becomes very political and he felt the Board should keep politics out of the discussion. He asked Mr. McCrory how this year's CIP has been prepared for the Board's review.

Mr. Wahrlich said that the Board had decided last year that the Planning Board's role in the review of the CIP was to determine that it was following the Master Plan. That was the vision and "we were the checks and balances to make sure". He said last year the Board wanted more information on the process and what was happening with it. He felt it would be good to review that again.

Mr. McCrory went over the eight criteria that are being used to rank the various department requests. He explained each criterion and the weighting factors that were assigned to each of them.

Mr. McCrory asked the Board members to do the review for Criterion 8, Consistency with the Master Plan, and bring their results to the next meeting. There was much discussion on how to accomplish this as they must use the 2011 Master Plan for the exercise and very few projects will be specifically stated in its text. It was ultimately agreed to use the following rating:

- "0" if it is not in the plan at all or if it is inconsistent with the Plan;

- “1” if it is conceptually in the Plan or within the “spirit” of the plan; and
- “2” if it is specifically stated in the Plan.

Results will be discussed at the next meeting.

The Board asked that completed projects be listed rather than just removed from the CIP.

VII. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

The meeting adjourned at 8:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
deForest Bearse
Resource Coordinator