



PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Monday, April 9, 2018 7:00 PM
City Hall Council Chambers

MINUTES

Approved 4/23/2018

I. Call to Order

Mr. Wahrlich called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and asked for a roll call.

II. Roll Call

Present: Allen Damren, Marlene Jordan, Bruce Kolenda, Charlene Lovett, David Putnam, Richard Wahrlich, David Pacetti, Marilyn Harris

Absent: William Greenrose, Nick Koloski, James Short

City Staff: Michael McCrory, City Planner

III. Review of Minutes

A. March 26, 2018

Mr. Wahrlich called for a motion on the minutes.

Motion: So moved

Made by: Mayor Lovett **Second:** Mr. Putnam

There was no discussion.

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Mr. Pacetti was welcomed as the Board's new alternate member.

Mr. Wahrlich asked Mr. Pacetti to sit in for Mr. Short.

Mayor Lovett appointed Ms. Jordan to seat 2 and Mr. Greenrose to Seat A-2.

Ms. Jordan sat in for Mr. Greenrose.

IV. 2018 Regulatory Updates and Other Initiatives

2018 year of implementation

Mr. McCrory said the Master Plan is now completed; City Council has created the Energy committee and members for it are actively being sought; and the Planning Board Rules of Procedure have been completed. It is now time to move on to land use regulations.

1. Site Plan Regulations: Mr. McCrory said he'd like to get this done right away.

2. Subdivision Regulations: Mr. McCrory is looking into a grant to fund update of these regulations. He predicted it would take about a year to complete. These regulations haven't been updated since the 70's.
3. Zoning Ordinance updates, including:
 - a. Housekeeping
 - b. Agriculture/agricultural uses
 - c. Signs – supreme court case requires it to be updated
 - d. Flood Zone Regulations – The City has recommended changes from the State Flood Plain Manager. The recommended change will keep these regulations up to date with federal flood plain regulations.

Mr. McCrory suggested asking the housing chapter subcommittee members to be part of a steering committee for updating the housing regulations. He would also ask a member of the Conservation Commission to serve on the committee.

Mr. Putnam suggested meeting at 6PM again for these work sessions. Mayor Lovett agreed. Mr. Wahrlich said he has a hard time in the summer getting out early; Mr. Kolenda said he faces the same difficulty with his job. Mr. McCrory suggested having one meeting a month dedicated to this work.

Mayor Lovett suggested having a steering committee work on the site plan regulations and then bringing them back to the Board, much like with the Master Plan.

Mr. Putnam said he prefers having the whole board work on them together so everyone learns about them while working on them. Ms. Harris, Mr. Kolenda and Mr. Wahrlich agreed.

It was ultimately agreed that the Board will meet at 6 PM to work on the regulations when there are applications to be heard. If there are no applications, then they will meet at 7PM.

Mr. McCrory felt it was important to have this meeting because the Board is required to have at least one meeting a month (and there are no applications for the next meeting), but also because he wanted the Board to know where things were going with the land use regulations. The regulation changes discussed this evening are very much based on what the Master Plan has. The zoning ordinance updates are still consistent with the Master Plan – they are very important. They predate the Master Plan, almost. The subdivision regulations will rely on Master Plan findings most heavily (of the three sets of regulations).

There was discussion about signs;

- City Center project spent a lot of time on signs which resulted in an update of the zoning ordinance; but there is still work to be done on them
- The HDC has final say over the appearance of signs in the Historic District
- Mr. McCrory wants to streamline the sign permit application for the Historic District as he believes there is an overlap in processes
- Placement, size, and current and new technologies all need to be reviewed in the sign ordinance (excluding the message of the sign – result from the Supreme Court decision)

V. Reports from Boards and Commissions

There were no reports.

VI. Other

Mayor Lovett said the Council had rescheduled their review of the CIP to their April 11th meeting.

Mayor Lovett asked Mr. Wahrlich if he would like to talk about the letter he had received from the City Council. Mr. Wahrlich said sure, then discovered he didn't have it with him to read. Then he asked the Mayor for clarification of which letter she was asking him to share. Mayor Lovett said she had drafted a letter that was reviewed by the City Council. They approved it and it was sent to every chair of every board, commission and committee. It was an outline from the City Council of what they would like to see as improvements between City Council and the various boards, commissions and committees. The chair was supposed to share it with each member of their respective board, committee or commission. The intent is to improve communication between those various boards, committees and commissions and City Council both ways and to open up opportunities for training. She requested that it be put on the agenda for the next meeting so the Board could discuss it. Mr. Wahrlich said that sounded fine.

Mayor Lovett said the letter she wrote on October 9th still hasn't been discussed in detail. She said, "Perhaps some of that discussion will happen when we have a review of the site plan regulations, because I know some of the questions raised in the letter would deal with those site plan regulations."

Mayor Lovett said, "At our meeting on March 28th, the City Council was asked to approve a rental agreement for the parking spaces in connection with the Goddard Block renovation. Basically, the rental agreement – we didn't see it at the time, but we were asked to approve it because the developer was having to close on April 6th. We weren't going to have our next City Council meeting until after his closing. When we were asked to approve the rental agreement, at that point in time, Mr. Lacasse was there at the Council meeting, we were told that the reconstruction was going to entail 36 apartments and that they would need an additional 22 parking spaces to meet the 1 space per unit variance that they were granted. One of the City Councilors asked, 'well please let the Planning Board know about this and perhaps they need to review the site application, because when we were presented with this project in September, it was with the intent that there would be 30-32 units within the reconstruction. Now we're up to 36. So, that's that update.'"

Mr. Wahrlich said he somewhat suspected that the Board would see that plan again. Mr. Putnam said he thought one of the Board's conditions of approval was that there was an agreed-upon number of spaces per unit – not how many spaces in all for the building, but that there were a certain number of spaces per unit. Mayor Lovett said no. Mr. Putnam asked if the regulations require more than one (space per unit).

Mayor Lovett said, “The ordinances currently say 1.5 spaces per unit. They went to the ZBA and were granted a variance for one parking space per unit. When they spoke with us in September with 30-32 apartments with – if you remember they said they would range from 2-bedroom to studio apartments – because of their funding package, it was required that 25% of their apartments would be 2-bedroom units. What we were given at that point in time – with 30-32 units – they were looking at needing 17 additional parking spaces. When we approved the site amendment it was with a condition that they would not be given a Certificate of Occupancy unless that parking situation had been addressed correctly. So, what they did is they went to the City Council before the Planning Board ever met with the developer and said to the City administration ‘we know we have a parking issue downtown. We’re asking you to come up with a plan because whatever we decide for this one particular project we want to be fair across the board.’ I know there has been work from the City administration side where they are trying to look at ‘well what is the right solution?’ I know they’ve looked at a parking garage as a potential solution, but that didn’t pan out because it’s just too expensive. In the meantime, this developer wants to move forward with his reconstruction of the Goddard Block and he has a closing date because we – if you recall he said – ‘it makes it more difficult for me to get my financing package together and approved when you put longer and longer lists of conditions on it.’ Because we – and it’s not that we did anything wrong, it’s fine – but he could not close without an agreement signed by the Council that says ‘you have these parking spaces.’ Because they’re not going to invest that kind of money into a project if... Be that as it may, that rental agreement has been voted on by the City Council and approved. He still has to fulfill the condition which is that those parking spaces have to be allotted to that project. When we first heard it, it was 17; now it is up to 22 because the number of apartments increased.”

Mr. Putnam asked how the different jurisdictions play in on making the final decision on the developer moving ahead.

Mr. McCrory, “I guess what this boils down to from a Planning Board perspective – and this is something I was not made aware of, so I am not prepared for the question - but let’s just presume there were 32 units approved in the original proposal. If it stepped up to 36 units, does that – according to this board – constitute a substantial change to the site plan? That’s a question I have to ask the Board. Since we’re talking at the Board level. Usually this is staff activity – determining if there is a substantial change to an approved site plan. But while we’re talking about it now, might as well put it to you guys. What do you think?”

Mr. Putnam said he remembers talking about the motion and making the requirement that they not get a Certificate of Occupancy unless they meet the requirements for parking. “I didn’t say in that motion how many apartments there were – we only knew at the time what the applicant was asking for. And I guess I want to know – with the change in the number of apartments does that mean we have to change our vote, our motion, to accommodate the additional parking, the different number of apartments? Or can that motion still stand,

accepting the fact that they have increased the number of apartments so now there has to be more parking available to meet the regulations for those new apartments?”

Mr. Wahrlich said, “I would think that if they are increasing the number of apartments they would have to increase the parking. I think the way it was presented to us was that it was something that the City was working with them on. So, I’m assuming right out that that’s what’s going on.”

Mr. Putnam said, “This seems awkward to me because it seems everything is being cobbled together here to make it work. It must put a lot of pressure on people.”

Mr. McCrory, “I would expect this to be the only time you see a proposal come to the Planning Board or the City Council this way. There is a very vigorous effort to deal with the parking downtown right now. It does in my mind since the Zoning Board granted a variance for one space per unit, and we did have a general understanding at the time of the application how many units there would be – that increasing the number of units – it has changed. I go back to my statement of very simply is that a substantial change to the site plan? Is that something that the Planning Board feels needs to come back before the Board for an amendment? When we talk about substantial change, we talk about site plan amendment.”

Mr. McCrory asked that the full Notice of Decision (for the Goddard Block site plan amendment) be read to the Board:

***NOTICE OF DECISION
CLAREMONT PLANNING BOARD***

***RE: Case No. PL 2017-00009: Application for Site Plan Approval
DATE: October 2, 2017***

***Property Owner: WSK Goddard LTD Partnership
Applicant: Same as Owner
Agent: Frank J. Barrett, Jr.
Property Address: 54-62 Pleasant Street
Parcel Tax ID: Map 120, Lot 85
Zoning: Mixed Use (MU)
City Services: Municipal Water and Sewer***

*The Claremont Planning Board at its meeting of September 25, 2017 and after due public hearing duly noticed, completed its consideration of the application for site plan approval for the property located at 54-62 Pleasant Street and shown as Tax Map 120, Lot 85, lying in the Mixed Use (MU) zoning district. The Claremont Planning Board **APPROVED Site Plan Review for a mixed-use renovation** with the following conditions of approval:*

Conditions of Approval

- 1. The Proposed Site Plan shall be completed substantially in accordance with the information provided by the applicant in the Site Plan Application Case No. PL 2017-00009 and testimony during the public hearing for said case.*

2. *The site shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the plan titled, "Goddard Block Revitalization, 54-62 Pleasant Street, Claremont, NH" dated July 21, 2017 and as amended. Additional drawings that have been reviewed to be submitted to the Planning Board and City staff - schematic floor plans prepared by Barrette Architecture pages 1,2, and 3, dated 8/1/2017.*
3. *The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits as determined by the Local, State, and Federal governments.*
4. *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. 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.
 - a. *CO is to be delivered when the project is completed and appropriate parking is identified.**
5. *This Site Plans is 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.*
6. *Two (2) copies of the final approved overall Site Plan, printed on mylar and in a form suitable for recording at the Sullivan County Registry of Deeds, shall be provided to the Claremont Planning and Development Department.*

Michael McCrory, City Planner, Planning & Development Department

Mr. McCrory noted that one thing the NOD doesn't specify (which he said would be dealt with internally for future applications) is ...he asked if minutes of the meeting where the decision was made were available (they were). He said, "The testimony that was provided, the folks present, it was 32 units – is that right?"

Mayor Lovett, "It was 30-32. I reviewed the minutes before we had the vote at the Council meeting. And I also reviewed the tape."

Mr. McCrory, "So if we had 32 and now it's 36, the question stands. Is that substantial change?"

Mr. Wahrlich said that if the appropriate parking is provided, then no.

Mr. Putnam said that it would depend, and that the Board now had to look at the Zoning Board's variance approval. If they said how many parking spots for how many bedrooms, because it was one car per bedroom. (This was corrected to one space per unit by Mr. McCrory and Mayor Lovett.) Mr. Putnam asked if the number 30-32 was referenced in their decision or if it was just left open. Mr. McCrory said he recollected it as being one space per unit. Mr. Putnam asked if that would stand up in court – so if we told them they needed 36 spots they would comply with that without contesting it? Mr. McCrory said absolutely. Mr. Putnam said that was all he needed to hear.

Mr. Wahrlich said they needed to think outside the box a little bit with what we have downtown. If they have 36 apartments, they need 36 spaces. Unless they go back to the zoning

board. Mayor Lovett didn't think this addressed the question that Mr. McCrory was asking. She said it's not about the parking. Mr. Wahrlich said Mr. McCrory is asking if the Board needs to review it.

Mayor Lovett said that what had been read to the Board – “if you recall, when they came in September, the schematic that we got was I believe just an external schematic. There wasn't any other schematics. At that point in time I think I raised the question about ‘where are the other – where are the floor plans? We don't have anything. And it was based on a site plan – the original, when we were presented with it – it was a site plan amendment to a site plan that was dated back in the 1980s.”

Mr. Wahrlich said the number of offices on a project he is currently working on had been changed. It did not go back in front of the Planning Board in Lebanon. It was an internal change. It just went through code enforcement. It wasn't a big deal. When you are dealing with a project this size it is not unusual to see it go up or down a little bit.

Mr. Damren said he somewhat concurred with that, but wondered where the break point is. He asked if it was usual or customary with no increase in the footprint of the space to have an increase in the number of units between 15% and 20%. Mr. Wahrlich said it would be a code enforcement issue under the square footage of each unit.

Mr. Damren asked what would drive the project back to the Planning Board for a revised site plan. Mr. Putnam said it would come back to the Board if they can't come up with the appropriate number of parking spots. Then they wouldn't be able to get their occupancy permit.

Mr. McCrory gave an example of a company wishing to build a 30,000-square foot building. They then decide to build a 40,000-square foot building. That might not be a substantial change. But if they want to double the size of the building, it might be.

Mr. McCrory said, “In the current site plan regulations there is some guidance on this. It's not necessarily in the context of what we're talking about right now. It is based on increased square footage of the footprint of the building, which is not being discussed here now. In this case we are talking about the intensity of the use of the building. There is an existing building. It started with 26 units; they put it up to 32. They found in their subsequent design analysis they could get an extra four out of it so they added those four to their design. That was something that was revealed when that parking agreement was being discussed. The fundamental difference, I think, is the number of parking spaces that are being reserved for use. I can't recall the general parameters of the lease agreement, but it is an overnight reservation and I believe they need to be open for use during the day to promote shared use of those spaces.”

Mr. McCrory explored possible other results of that intensity – increased parking; increased water and sewer usage – but those are covered by impact fees and regular usage fees. That's effectively underground. There is a built environment around this building – there is already a sidewalk, walkways, etc. – The interior of the building is going to be revamped.

Mayor Lovett said, “But the back is going to change. They are talking about landscaping and exits.”

Mr. McCrory said, “That’s all existing hardscapes, so there is a benefit to the site by increased landscaping. But those additional four units I don’t believe are going to change that layout.”

Mr. McCrory said, “The intent was to get all the parking needs confirmed and finalized before the CO could be issued. That’s probably a year out. So, there is time to work on it some more. With the closing approaching, the attorneys for the project said they needed the agreement immediately, before the closing. It was unanticipated. It was rushed to City Council – not in an ideal fashion. It is something we wish to remedy before any future proposals come before any boards.”

Mr. McCrory said, “When we think of the impact of the four additional units, do they substantially change the character of the site plan that was approved? I am putting this to the Board – I want the Board to decide this. Personally, my professional opinion is considering the existing landscape, the existing building, no change in footprint, and, quite honestly, the approval from City Council, I would say there is no substantial change.”

Mr. Kolenda asked if the location of the four apartments was known. The storefronts at the ground level have to stay as storefronts, so he wanted to know where the four additional apartments would be located. Mr. McCrory said the storefronts would remain as such.

Mr. Kolenda asked if the board would be seeing a set of plans showing the final layout before construction begins. Mr. McCrory said that was before the building inspectors, being reviewed as part of the building permit process. Mr. Putnam asked if the board would see them though. Mr. McCrory said there was no plan to present them. He cited the Ford dealership buildings as an example – the floor plans were not presented. Neither were they for the new Jewel Trucking building. He said he did not see how it was relevant to the site plan. What is known is the number of units in the building.

Mr. Damren said he thought everyone could agree that they want to see the project succeed. He felt this was evident by the actions all the boards had taken. He said the plans and drawings that were presented to the board had been “pretty rough – perhaps not the type we would envision seeing every single time. We went ahead with it because we wanted this to be succeeding.” He asked if the parking agreement had yet been reduced to writing. Mr. McCrory did not know. Mr. Damren said, “Certainly as far as the City Council was concerned, when we had to make our vote, that was one of the questions I think most of us had was- it sure would help if we knew what that rental agreement looked like. Other than varying opinions or thoughts and so on. Again, we all wanted the project to move ahead so we voted for it. But it was with one of these (fingers crossed). And I think we just need to see it in writing. Is the site plan regs that we’re going to be seeing – will that provide us guidance as best as possible regarding how to approach questions like we’re having here tonight?”

Mr. McCrory said the new regulations would change this process – the determination of substantial change – for example, in this case, the Board might opt to kick it to a Technical Review Committee to review and discuss and then render a determination. If the TRC found

that - for whatever reason - it needed to have full planning board review, then it would be passed on to the Planning Board. In this kind of situation, this is probably where this would go in the process.

Mr. McCrory said, "I recall discussing with Nancy Merrill that she had intended to review the parameters of the lease agreement with the City Council. Was that presented?"

Mr. Damren said she had done so, but it was all an oral presentation. He said, "We had simply wanted to say 'this is pretty serious and affects a number of things related to this project. It sure would help if we could see it in writing sooner rather than later.' And as you have stated if they have already gone to closing and the attorneys have approved all of the various pieces, it should be in writing and it sure would help if we got a copy of it."

Mr. McCrory said he would have to ask.

Mayor Lovett said there was a "lack of clarity in some of the variables within the rental agreement because there was discussion back and forth." Mr. Damren said, "Which can all be cleaned up once we see it in writing."

Mr. Putnam said, "So you made a comment a few moments ago, Mike, in that after we had made our ruling and it had declared that they could continue the project but would not be given the occupancy approval until the parking was satisfied meaning they had to go ahead and secure the project and start working on it. But then you told us the lawyers stepped in and required the decision to be made. So is it likely that lawyers would step ahead of our decision in the future – and I'm wondering how much we would have to anticipate other legal decisions in the future when complicated projects like this come along."

Mr. McCrory said one could never anticipate what lawyers are going to do. He said, "This surprised everybody. We can try to the best of our ability to prepare for it."

Mr. Putnam said he wanted to go back to what Mayor Lovett referenced in her list of other things. He said, "We talked about the letters that went back and forth a little and I want to remember – when we did our restructuring this year at the beginning of the year – we talked about who was going to handle correspondence and how it would be provided to the Board. I don't want to stray or sway away from what we all agreed upon. So, I remember that we discussed that all correspondence to the Board would come through the planning office. And that if the chairman or the vicechair receives something in the mail, they would forward it to deForest and then it would be provided to us."

Mr. Wahrlich said, "The way I read the letter, I thought it was addressed more to me. And that basically I needed to do some homework and present a little outline of where the planning board was and what it needed to do and so forth. ... I'm not good sometimes with my homework."

Mr. Putnam said he wasn't trying to put Mr. Wahrlich "up against the wall" – he just wanted to be clear - any letter that was received - that it was intended for the whole Board. He said the Mayor was expecting the whole Board to have seen her letter as part of the Board's correspondence. Mr. McCrory said that if a letter is addressed to the chair of a board, for example any letter that he addresses to City Council is addressed to the Mayor and City

Council. If he intends something for just the Mayor, he addresses it just to the Mayor. Perhaps in this case there was a misinterpretation of how the letter was intended.

The Mayor said she thought the letter was addressed to Boards, Committees and Commissions and the request to the Council Clerk was to send it out to the chairs of each entity.

Mr. Wahrlich said he thought the path of where the Board is going is pretty clear. The Mayor asked to have it put on the agenda for the next meeting and have it in the packet so the Board can discuss it, because “there is more to talk about”. It would have been unproductive for the Board to try and discuss it at this meeting as the members had not seen it.

Mayor Lovett said she had one more thing to say about a site plan amendment and “how it may be different from a floor plan for a Ford dealership or whatever the other example was”. The Mayor said, “When that application came before us, from a global perspective, we’re looking at a project with rental housing for - we have had lots of conversations about workforce housing and all this other stuff – and from a global perspective we’re trying to look at the community’s planning purposes and how we’re going to get this type of housing into the community and does this project push that needle forward? So, when we don’t have plans, schematics of the internals of how many units – what’s the percentage of studios to one-bedrooms to two-bedrooms – then we as a board - we really don’t know what the final outcome of this project is going to be.”

Mr. Wahrlich, “I don’t think you can really expect that out of a project this size. I think if you turn around and take the percentage of change in the amount of people in that building, it’s pretty minute. Now we’re trying to micromanage the project. That’s why we have our code enforcement folks to make sure it stays within the parameters.”

Mayor Lovett, “I disagree but that brings me to my next point at this point. I think we spend a lot of time of not being sure of certain things. And we are – all of us – the City Council, the Land Use boards - do not have legal counsel onsite. And sometimes we run into a situation in which it would be quite helpful to have that. Because I don’t think we’re always certain of what our authority is, what our responsibilities are, or what we should be looking at.”

Mr. Wahrlich said he thought that would only slow things down more.

Mayor Lovett, “I’m just saying – especially on these high-profile big projects where there’s a lot of money at stake, people are putting a lot of resources and time into something, it might be beneficial to have legal counsel here. And the land use boards do have that authority to request legal counsel to be present. And I just want to give you that information because I think this is about educating ourselves. And I also - in addition to all of the work we have to do - you know, that’s part of the letter – what are the training opportunities because to be the best board that we can be requires us to be, you know, take some time to be trained on some different situations.”

Mr. Pacetti asked the Mayor, “Do they have all of the required parking spaces that they need for all of the units, the 36 units?” The Mayor said yes, through the rental agreement that was signed by the City Council.

Mr. McCrory said, “I think we had this conversation when we developed the Rules of Procedure – that Planning Board members are encouraged to understand those applications that are before them and are encouraged to ask questions, inquire and request more information. I will be totally honest. I feel my presence here as staff and professional here in this field is unappreciated with that statement. If you have a question, you ask me. And I can find that answer.”

Mr. Kolenda asked for clarification of which statement Mr. McCrory was referring to. Mr. McCrory said it was with regard to the attorney. Mr. Putnam said he was thinking the same thing. Mr. Wahrlich agreed.

Ms. Harris said to Mr. McCrory that he and his knowledge are greatly appreciated. From a cost-saving perspective, she said she felt the Board should always try other avenues before an attorney is brought in. She felt that if the Board had a question or a lack of understanding and Mr. McCrory was unable to answer it, “certainly we should be able to take it to an attorney”.

Mr. McCrory said he didn’t disagree with that. “Regardless, we’re not going to have an attorney standing here at every meeting. There would be a continuance where there will be an inquiry made.” Mr. McCrory would be the one forwarding that inquiry.

Mayor Lovett said it wasn’t her intent to have an attorney present at every meeting.

Ms. Harris said she thought this was a bit of miscommunication.

Mayor Lovett said she apologized if Mr. McCrory took offense to her statement. She said she was specifically “thinking about issues in which the applicant’s here, there is no legal counsel here, you’re not a lawyer – that’s not a hit against you, but sometimes we are in – the Council’s in the same situation, too. And we don’t have a legal counsel available at that point in time to get an answer. And sometimes if we’re talking about efficiency and being proactive, when you have an applicant - I’m not talking about every time - but the more complicated ones. The ones that just...there’s as many opportunities for complications as pitfalls in these high-profile, complex issues, that sometimes it would behoove us ... and it’s a planning board decision because the planning board can call legal counsel to be there. But it’s not a hit against your expertise as a City Planner.”

Mr. Wahrlich said he didn’t see this project as being that complicated.

Mayor Lovett said, “We have different opinions here. All I know is other councils, other cities, other planning boards do have this at certain times. It is to their benefit. It is not anything against the expertise or the qualifications of the people in the room. It is an attempt to try to get issues resolved onsite. And we have this at the City Council level at times, it happens. I am bringing you information – that’s all. If you want to use it, fine. It wasn’t meant as a slam.”

Mr. Wahrlich said, “Have we beat this down enough?” He asked if there was any other business.

Mr. McCrory said it was final call for the April 28th OSI planning and zoning conference registration. He said this is a training opportunity. The City will cover the cost of the registration.

Ms. Harris said she would not be able to attend the conference due to prior obligations and asked if there would be recordings of the conference or if there was someplace she could go to view the materials. Mr. McCrory said he had been talking with the people at NHMA about his participating in trainings like this. He was thinking about how he could take these trainings here first and then take them on the road if needed. He said he spoke with the City Manager “and this is under ‘other’, and so having our municipal attorneys come in for a training session has been discussed. The City Manager offered and Mr. McCrory “gladly accepted” the municipal attorney’s time to do a training session. He said he would see it as a joint training session with the planning and zoning boards. He wanted the board to know this is in the works right now.

Mayor Lovett asked Mr. McCrory who he was talking about doing the training. Mr. McCrory said Gardner, Fulton and Waugh. Mayor Lovett said, “Yes, because this is part of the letter I sent out to all of the Boards, Committees and Commissions and the Council that was ... so it’s the same thing. With the Council has already ...” Mr. McCrory said he hadn’t seen this letter. Mayor Lovett said, “Oh. Okay. What it is, is Gardner, Fulton and Waugh have offered a two-hour free session to the City Council and the land use boards for legal updates. So, the Council discussed potential dates and then I have to deconflict the days that each of the land use boards meet and then figure out what is the best day. So, you’ll be getting a letter from the City Council that will say what are these potential dates and you’ll already know from the letter what’s available from the firm and then if you can come, you can come.”

Mr. Putnam asked if this was different from the planning/zoning training Mr. McCrory was talking about. Mr. McCrory said he would have to check with the City Manager as to his intent. He said he didn’t know how much overlap there is between City Council and land use boards.

VII. Correspondence

Healthy Vibrant Claremont article in the Vital Communities magazine featuring planning board member, David Putnam and the Mayor.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

The meeting adjourned at 8:27 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
deForest Bearse
Resource Coordinator