



Planning Board Meeting
Monday, April 8, 2013
Council Chambers, City Hall at 7:00 pm

MINUTES
Approved 4.22.13

I. Roll Call

Present: Peter Guillette, Andy Austin, Richard Wahrlich, William Greenrose, Rusty Fowler, Victor Bergeron, Ruben Ramirez, James Neilsen IV, Ken Harlow (alt), James Short (alt)

Absent: Bruce Kolenda

City Staff: Michael McCrory, Interim City Planner; Jane Taylor, City Solicitor; Kelly LeBlanc, Administrative Assistant

Kenneth Harlow will sit in for Bruce Kolenda.

II. Review of Minutes March 25, 2013

Motion: to approve minutes from March 25, 2013

Made By: Mr. Greenrose

Second: Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous

III. Old Business

- Possible reconsideration of approval for 54 Summer Street, Map 131, Lot 6.

No motion was made for the reconsideration of approval for 54 Summer Street.

- Claremont City Center Project – Review of Site Plan Regulations

On Wednesday, April 10, 2013, City Council will discuss the proposed Site Plan Review regulations.

City staff is in the process of establishing the Technical Review Committee (TRC) which would consist of appointed municipal administrators responsible for reviewing minor site plans. Applications that fall under the Minor Site Plan submission requirements would go to the TRC versus Planning Board. The goal is to make the site plan process easier and promote economic development. Currently, the standards default back to the major site plan. The first reading will be Wednesday night and the 2nd reading will be in May.

Mr. McCrory stated that the ordinance is written so that the Planning Board approves the standards so that it would not have to go back to City Council. The TRC will report back to the Planning Board with their decisions (a minimum of monthly reports).

Mr. Fowler is concerned that the TRC could approve retail to restaurant scenarios. Mr. McCrory read the proposed Minor site plan conditions (GET INFO FROM MIKE).

If during the TRC process the public is able to provide information on the application and states it needs to go to the Planning Board, then the TRC has the ability to send the application to the Planning Board.

Mr. Greenrose would like to know if the gunshop would have come to the board or TRC. Mr. McCrory stated it would have gone to the TRC. The TRC could have made a decision or sent it to the board. The original intent of the TRC was to streamline the process for smaller projects.

Ms. Taylor stated that there is an appeal process regarding the decision of the TRC.

Mr. Bergeron stated the idea was to streamline the process and save applicants money. The TRC is an ongoing project which began approximately 2 years ago. The project is designed to be what is best for the city.

Mr. Fowler confirmed that the applicant still needs to meet building code and life safety code.

The TRC would take the place of the waiver process.

Mr. Greenrose asked about the approximate percentage of applications that would be handled by the TRC versus the board. Mr. McCrory stated that he roughly estimates 40-50% of site plan applications would go before the TRC.

The TRC will be department heads/administrative staff (P&D director, fire, police, DPW, code enforcement, city engineer/ project manager). If a Planning Board member made comments at a TRC meeting and the application was appealed, those comments could be used as prejudice with that application.

Submission criteria will be addressed at a future meeting.

IV. Reports from Boards and Commissions

Mr. Fowler attended the traffic safety committee meeting last Thursday; a report will be issued next month.

V. Adjournment

Motion: to Adjourn

Made By: Mr. Fowler

Second: Mr. Ramirez

Vote: Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 PM

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Kelly LeBlanc